

H. ref. 174 ^t₋ (2)

<36639029620017

<36639029620017

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

RE-ISSUE, IN 36 PARTS, ONE SHILLING EACH;
PART I. JUST PUBLISHED, TO BE CONTINUED EVERY FORTNIGHT.

NEW WORK—JUST PUBLISHED.

In Three handsome Octavo Volumes, bound in cloth, Price £2. 2s.

EMBELLISHED WITH SEVENTY-THREE ENGRAVINGS ON WOOD, A NEW OMNIGRAPHED MAP
OF THE UNITED STATES, AND A PORTRAIT OF THE AUTHOR ON STEEL,

A M E R I C A,
HISTORICAL—STATISTIC—AND DESCRIPTIVE.
BY JAMES S. BUCKINGHAM, ESQ.

Lord Ashburton to Mr. Buckingham.

"I have read a considerable portion of your work on America—my long residence in that country leading me to take a deep interest in whatever concerns the great republic—and I have found in it more general and varied information than in any of the numerous works on the same subject which have issued from the press. I am bound also to say, that, though I do not agree with you in all your views and opinions, they seem to bear the stamp of general impartiality and candour."

George Catlin, Esq., of New York, to Mr. Buckingham.

"My wife and myself, now residing in London, have read your very interesting Work on our native country, America, with peculiar satisfaction; inasmuch as the nature of my pursuits has led us to visit nearly all the places and institutions you have so vividly and so justly described in your pages. In reading them, we have been carried along by a feeling scarcely less vivid and less real than if we were fellow-travellers with you, and actually passing over the scenes you have so graphically described. I think you have brought to the Parent-Country, a very encouraging and just account of her Transatlantic Child, and this at a time when general and correct information is peculiarly desirable, to remove mutual prejudices, and to promote a fair and friendly understanding between the two Countries."

List of Subscribers.

FOR THE ROYAL LIBRARY—ST. JAMES'S PALACE—TWO COPIES
HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE ALBERT—BUCKINGHAM PALACE
HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF SUSSEX—KENSINGTON

A.

His Grace the Duke of Argyll, Lord
Steward of her Majesty's House-
hold
Right Hon. Lord Abinger, Chief
Baron of Her Majesty's Exchequer
Right Hon. the Earl Amherst, late
Governor-General of India.
Right Hon. Lord Ashburton
Henry Alexander Esq., Director of
the East India Company
James Alexander, Esq.
G. W. Alexander, Esq.
John Angerstein, Esq.
Neill Arnott, Esq. M.D.
Wolverley Attwood, Esq. M.P.
James Anderton, Esq.
William Allen, Esq. F.R.S.
Sir George Arthur, Bart., K.C.B.,
late Governor of Upper Canada
Vice-Admiral Sir C. Adam, K.C.B.
M.P.
Edward Thomas Allan, Esq.

B.

His Grace the Duke of Bedford.
Sir Robert Bateson, Bart. M.P.
Right Hon. Lord Brougham, F.R.S.
Col. H. D. Baillie, M.P.
William Butterworth Bayley, Esq.
Chairman of the E.I. Company
Right Hon. Gen. Lord Viscount
Beresford, G.C.B., G.C.H.
John Brocklehurst, Esq. M.P.
Sir J. Yarde Buller, Bart. M.P.
Beriah Botfield, M.P., F.R.S.
Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Bart.
Abraham Beaumont, Esq.
J. T. Barber Beaumont, Esq. F.S.A.
W. Behnes, Esq. Sculptor
Edward M. Barrett, Esq.
Thomas Bish, Esq.
Jno. Britton, Esq. F.S.A.—2 copies
Samuel Boddington, Esq.
Charles Boyd, Jun. Esq.
Timothy Bevington, Esq.
Richard Bethell, Esq. M.P.

B

Sir Chas. M. Burrell, Bart. M.P.
Right Hon. Lord Bolton.
Right Hon. the Earl of Burlington
Lieut. J. H. Brown, R.N.
John Ivatt Briscoe, Esq. M.P.
Miles Burkitt, Esq.
Benj. Guy Babington, Esq. M.D.
George Boulton, Esq.,
Thomas Wm. Bramston, Esq. M.P.
J. D. Bassett, Esq.
John Bell, Esq. Wandsworth
Henry Betts, Esq. Clapham
Right Hon. Sir Harford Jones
Brydges, Bart.

C.

Right Hon. the Earl of Clarendon,
Lord Privy Seal
Rt. Hon. the Earl of Carlisle, K.G.
Right Hon. Lord Carbery
William Millar Christy, Esq.
His Excellency Sir William Cole-
brooke, Gov. of New Brunswick
Herbert B. Curteis, Esq. M.P.
Gideon Colquhoun, Esq.
Wm. Sharman Crawford, Esq. M.P.
John Patterson Clark, Esq.
George Catlin, Esq. of New York
David Cannan, Esq.
Sir George Crewe, Bart. M.P.
Samuel Cartwright, Esq.
Aaron Chapman, Esq. M.P.
Jno. Walbanke Childers, Esq. M.P.
Thomas Cochrane, Esq.
E. Stillingfleet Cayley, Esq. M.P.
Mr. Alderman Copeland, M.P.
Richard Cobden, Esq. M.P.

D.

His Grace the Duke of Devonshire,
K.G., D.C.L.
Rt. Hon. the Earl of Derby, K.G.
Rt. Hon. the Earl of Ducie
The Lord Bishop of Durham
Admiral Sir Philip Durham, G.C.B.
Right Hon. Lord Dacre

D.

Capt. Dundas, R.N., C.B., M.P.
Mrs. H. R. Drewry
T. Slingsby Duncombe, Esq. M.P.
Rt. Hon. the Earl of Devon
Edward Divett, Esq. M.P.
J. S. W. E. Drax, Esq. M.P.
Lord Darlington, M.P.

E.

Rt. Hon. Lord Viscount Ebrington,
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Rt. Hon. Lord Francis Egerton,
F.R.S., M.P.
Lord Eliot, M.P.
Wynn Ellis, Esq. M.P.
Neil Benjamin Edmonstone, Esq.
East India Director
William Evans, Esq. M.P.
Sir Thomas Esmonde, Bart.
Mrs. Sarah Stickney Ellis
John Epps, Esq. M.D.
The Hon. Mounstuart Elphinstone,
M.R.A.S.
Right Hon. Edward Ellice, M.P.

F.

Right Hon. the Earl of Fife, K.T
G.C.B., K.S., K.S.F.
Lord Charles Fitzroy, M.P.
Sir Charles Forbes, Bart.
Sir Hesketh Fleetwood, Bart. M.P.
Capt. Charles Forbes
Miss Forbes
George Forbes, Esq.
James Stewart Forbes, Esq.
Rev. Alexander Fletcher
Edward Fletcher, Esq.
John Fielden, Esq. M.P.
Major-General Fraser, E.I.C.S.
Capt. J. W. Fraser, E.I.C.S.
William Freeman, Esq.
Thomas Fortescue, Esq. M.P.
William Fielden, Esq. M.P.

G.

Right Hon. Lord Gray
Captain J. M. Grindlay—2 copies

110 g 2

G.

Sir Alexander Grant, Bart. M.P.
 Right Hon. the Earl of Gosford
 Hudson Gurney, Esq.
 Isaac L. Goldsmid, Esq.—2 copies
 William Greig, Esq.—3 copies.
 Samuel Gurney, Esq.
 Col. Galloway, K.C.B., Director
 of the East India Company.
 Robert Gordon, Esq. M.P. Secretary
 to the Treasury
 Sir John Josiah Guest, Bart. M.P.
 Robert Green, Esq.
 James Grattan, Esq. M.P.
 Capt. the Hon. R. Gore, R.N., M.P.

H.

Lord Claud Hamilton, M.P.
 Lord Marcus Hill, M.P.
 His Excellency Sir John Harvey,
 G.C.B. Gov. of Newfoundland.
 Major-Gen. Right Hon. Sir Henry
 Hardinge, K.C.B. M.P.
 Sir Henry Halford, Bart. G.C.H.,
 F.R.S. President of the Royal
 College of Physicians.
 John Hardy, Esq. Bradford.
 W. Hughes Hughes, Esq.
 Daniel Whittle Harvey, Esq.
 B. R. Haydon, Esq.
 Kedgwin Hoskins, Esq. M.P.
 Henry Howell, Esq.
 Joseph Hume, Esq. M.P.
 James Hutchinson, Esq.
 Rowland Hill, Esq.—Post Office.
 Frederick Harrison, Esq.
 Sir Benjamin Heywood, Bart,
 R. S. Holford, Esq.
 Sir Henry Hugh Hoare, Bart. F.S.A.
 Stourhead
 Edwin Hill, Esq. Bruce Castle
 William Alers Hankey, Esq.
 Thomas Hankey, Esq.
 Frederick Huth, Esq. Director of
 the Bank of England
 Mat. Davenport Hill, Esq. Queen's
 Counsel.
 Henry Handley, Esq. M.P.
 Charles Hindley, Esq. M.P.
 W. Heathcote, Esq. M.P.
 George Harvey, Esq.
 Sir Robert Heron, Bart. M.P.
 Capt. C. J. B. Hamilton, M.P.

I.

Robert Ingham, Esq. M.P.
 Henry Ibbotson, Esq.
 Islington Literary Institution

J.

Earl Jermyn, M.P.
 William Janson, Esq.
 S. Jaudon, Esq. of Philadelphia
 William Johnson, Esq.
 Julius Jeffreys, Esq. F.R.S.
 Alexander Johnstone, Esq. M.P.
 Sir Richard Jenkins, Bart. G.C.B.
 Deputy Chairman of the East
 India Company.

K.

Right Hon. Lord Kinnaird
 Lord Viscount Kelburne, M.P.
 Charles Kean, Esq.
 Right Hon. Sir Edward Knatchbull,
 Bart. M.P.
 Alexander Konarsky, Esq. M.D.
 Physician to the Army, Warsaw
 Major the Hon. George Keppel,
 Queen's Household
 A. V. Kirwan, Esq. Inner Temple
 Henry Kent, Esq.

L.

Most Noble the Marquis of Lans-
 downe, K.G. F.R.S. President of
 the Queen's Council
 Rt. Hon. Chs. Shaw Lefevre, M.P.
 Speaker of the H. of Commons
 Hon. Charles Langdale, M.P.
 London Institution, Aldersgate
 London Institution, Finsbury
 Right Hon. the Earl of Lonsdale
 K.G. F.S.A.
 John Temple Leader, Esq. M.P.
 G. G. de H. Larpent, Esq. M.P.
 G. D. Longstaff, Esq. M.D.
 Charles Lushington, Esq. M.P.
 Capt. W. Lacey, E.I.C.S.

L.

William Ley, Esq. H. of Commons
 Col. Gore Langton, M.P.
 John Loch, Esq. Director of the East
 India Company
 Sir Charles Lemon, Bart. M.P.
 LL.D. F.R.S.
 John Lee, Esq. LL.D. Doctor's
 Commons
 Right Hon. Lord Lilford
 James Loch, Esq. M.P.
 Sir Ralph Lopes, Bart.
 Walter Long, Esq. M.P.
 Right Hon. H. Labouchere, M.P.
 President of the Board of Trade.

M.

Right Hon. Lord Viscount Melville,
 K.L., F.R.S.
 Lord Viscount Morpeth, M.P.,
 Chief Secretary for Ireland
 Hon. C. A. Murray, Comptroller of
 the Queen's Household
 James Morrison, Esq. M.P.
 London Mechanic's Institute
 Robert McCallan, Esq.
 Marylebone Literary Institution
 Eneas Mackintosh, Esq.
 Major-Gen. Sir Donald Macleod,
 K.C.B., E.I.C.S.
 Sir Francis W. Macnaghten, Bart.
 Edmund C. Macnaghten, Esq.
 Francis Macnaghten, Esq.
 Elliott Macnaghten, Esq.
 Sir Charles and Lady Morgan,
 Knightsbridge
 Sir Moses Montefiore, Bart.
 James Mackillop, Esq.
 J. M. Morgan, Esq.
 Sir Charles Theophilus Metcalfe,
 Bart. Governor of Jamaica
 R. Monkton Milnes, Esq. M.P.
 Right Hon. Lord Monson
 James Malcolmson, Esq.

N.

Most Noble the Marquis of Nor-
 manby, Secretary of State for the
 Home Department
 His Grace the Duke of Newcastle,
 Edward Newton, Esq. [K.G.
 Joseph Netherclift, Esq.
 Nathaniel Nicholls, Esq.
 Joseph Neeld, Esq. F.S.A., M.P.
 G. W. Norman, Esq. Bromley
 His Grace the Duke of Northum-
 berland, K.G., Chancellor of the
 University of Cambridge

O

Wm. Oxley, Esq. M.D.—2 copies
 Wm. Smith O'Brien, Esq. M.P.

P.

Right Hon. Lord Plunkett, Lord
 Chancellor of Ireland
 Right Hon. Lord Viscount Palmer-
 ston, M.P., Secretary of State for
 Foreign Affairs
 Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart.,
 D.C.L. F.R.S. M.P.
 George Palmer, Esq. M.P.
 Chs. Pearson, Esq. City Solicitor
 Mark Phillips, Esq. M.P.
 Mark Beauchamp Peacock, Esq.
 James Painter, Esq.
 John Meeson Parsons, Esq.
 J. P. Plumptre, Esq. M.P.
 Robert Prowett, Esq.
 Right Hon. Lord Panmure, M.P.
 E. W. Wynne Pendarves, Esq.
 Joseph Pease, Esq. M.P.
 J. Parker, Esq. M.P. Secretary to
 the Admiralty
 Mrs. Thomas Pringle
 William Patey, Esq.—2 copies
 William Pinney, Esq. M.P.
 Sir John Henry Pelly, Bart. Gover-
 nor of the Bank of England
 Sir Robert Ker Porter, K.C.B. late
 Chargé d'Affaires, at Venezuela
 Henry Pownall, Esq.
 Mr. Alderman Pirie

R.

Right Hon. Lord John Russell,
 Secretary of State for the Colonies
 Rev. Septimus Ramsey, MA.
 Professor Gabriele Rosetti, LL.D.
 King's College

R.

Sir George Henry Rose, Bart.
 Sir Henry Russell, Bart. E.I.C.S.
 Sir David Roche, Bart. MP.
 T. Richardson, Esq. Stamford Hill
 Thomas Robinson, Esq. Stepney
 Major Gen. Archibald Robertson,
 Director of the East India Comp.

S.

His Grace the Duke of Sutherland,
 KG, Stafford House
 His Excellency Lord Sydenham,
 Governor-General of Canada
 Lieut. General the Right Hon. Lord
 Seaton, GCB, late Governor-Gen.
 of Canada
 Lord Dudley Coutts Stuart
 Sir George Staunton, Bart. MP.
 Joshua Scholefield, Esq. MP.
 John Squire, Esq.
 R. W. Sivier, Esq.—R. Polytechnic
 Charles Standish, Esq. MP.
 H. Shank, Esq. Director of E.I.C.
 Rev. J. Pye Smith, DD, FRS.
 Robert Spankie, Esq. Queen's Serg
 Col. the Hon. Leicester Stanhope
 Rev. Dr C. F. A. Steinkopff
 Stephen W. Silver, Esq.
 Bernard G. Snow, Esq. Highgate
 Sir G. Strickland, Bart. MP.
 J. Smith, Esq.—22, Grosvenor Sq.
 J. Spurgin, Esq., MD.
 Rev. Richard J. St. Aubyn, Putney
 Sir Gray Skipwith, Bart.
 Right Hon. the Earl Stanhope, Pre-
 sident of the Society for the Sup-
 pression of Intemperance
 Sir Henry Strachey, Bart.
 Lord James Stuart, MP.

T.

Hon. J. Tollemache, M.P.
 John Hyacinth Talbot, Esq. MP.
 John Thomas, Esq. Highgate
 Joseph Thomas, Esq.
 Col. T. Perronet Thompson
 Charles Augustus Tulk, Esq.
 Thomas Twining, Esq.
 John Travers, Esq.
 Mrs John Thelwall
 George Tomline, Esq. MP.
 Sir John Thorold, Bart.
 Edward Turner, Esq. MP.

V.

Right Hon. Gen. Sir Hussey Vivian,
 Bart. MP. Master-General of the
 Ordnance
 John Henry Vivian, Esq. MP.

W.

Most Noble the Marquis of Welles-
 ley, KG., ex-Governor-General of
 India
 Right Hon. Lord Western
 Henry George Ward, Esq. MP.
 Sir Matthew Wood, Bart. MP.
 Western Literary Institution
 Charles Whiting, Esq.
 Wm. Woolryche Whitmore, Esq.
 Robert Warner, Esq.
 Jno. Wilks, Esq. Finsbury Square
 Thomas Warkins, Esq.
 George Wilbraham, Esq. MP.
 Walter Weldon, Esq.
 Richd. Walkden, Esq. Pinner Park
 Hon. R. Bootle Wilbraham, MP.
 George Wilson, Esq.
 Sir John Williams, Knt. Judge
 Andrew White, Esq. MP.
 Westminster Mechanics' Institute
 Benjamin Wood, Esq. MP.
 David Williams Wire, Esq.
 Rev. Charles Bathurst Woodman
 Wm. Battie Wrightson, Esq. MP.
 Mrs. Jane M. Walker—of Bengal
 Miss Harriett Wright
 Francis Warden, Esq. Director of
 the East India Company
 John Walter, Esq. MP.

Y.

George Frederick Young, Esq.
 Rev. Dr. Young
 Col. James Young
 William Rayner Young, Esq.
 Henry Redhead Yorke, Esq. MP.

SHEFFIELD.

David Borreo, Esq.
John Bridgeford, Esq.
Charles Cammell, Esq.
Henry Cocker, Esq.
Ebenezer Elliott, Esq.
Michael Ellison, Esq.
John Fewsdale, Esq.
William Hancock, Esq.
Francis Hoole, Esq.
William Ibbotson, Esq.
Sir Arnold J. Knight, M.D.
Henry Longden, Esq.
John Martin, Esq.
James Moorhouse, Esq.
George P. Naylor, Esq.
Samuel Roberts, Esq.
C. H. Purser, Esq.
Thomas Scantlebury, Esq.
Edward Smith, Esq.
John W. Smith, Esq.
Edward Vickers, Esq.
Henry Vickers, Esq.
William Vickers, Esq.
John Wilson, Esq.
Anthony Whittaker, Esq.
Mechanics' Library.

MANCHESTER.

John Brooks, Esq.
Thomas Bazeley, Esq.
Richard Cobden, Esq.
Joseph Compton, Esq.
T. B. Crompton, Esq.
George Faulkner, Esq.
Thomas Goadsby, Esq.
Walter Gow, Esq.
B. Hyam, Esq.
John Harding, Esq.
John Kennedy, Esq.
Geo. Langworthy, Esq.
Thomas Mauley, Esq.
Thomas Mason, Esq.
Sir Thomas Potter.
T. B. W. Sanderson, Esq.
J. B. Smith, Esq.
Thomas Smith, Esq.
Junius Smith, Esq.
John Southam, Esq.
Justice Southam, Esq.
J. V. Vernon, Esq.

LIVERPOOL.

Thos. Bolton, Esq., Mayor.
Edward Cropper, Esq.
John Cropper, Jun., Esq.
William Fawcett, Esq.
Jno. Finch, Esq. 2 copies
Abraham Gartside, Esq.
Vincent Higgins, Esq.
T. A. Hope, Esq.
Lawrence Heyworth, Esq.
Harold Littledale, Esq.
H. C. Langton, Esq.
James Muspratt, Esq.
Richard Rathbone, Esq.
Theodore Rathbone, Esq.
William Rathbone, Esq.
E. Rawlings, jun., Esq.
J. C. Shaw, Esq.
Rigby Wason, Esq.
E. Wilson, Esq. 2 copies
Henry Winch, Esq.
Sir Joshua Walmsley
Richard V. Yates, Esq.

ROCHDALE.

J. Bright, Esq. 2 copies.
John Bright, Esq.
Thomas Booth, jun., Esq.
James Chadwick, Esq.
John Chadwick, Esq.
Thomas Chadwick, Esq.
W. Hanson, Esq.
John Holgate, Esq.
George Howarth, Esq.
James King, Esq.
Henry King, Esq.
Peter M'Kenzie, Esq.
William Roberts, Esq.
Robert Schofield, Esq.
Rd. Shuttleworth, Esq.

BRADFORD.

Mrs. Baines.
Thomas Beaumont, Esq.
W. Cheeseborough, Esq.
Blakey Calvert, Esq.
Henry Forbes, Esq.
Henry Harris, Esq.
Alfred Harris, Esq.
Henry Leah, Byerley Hall
Robert Milligan, Esq.

Walter Milligan, Esq.
James Rennie, Esq.
W. Ripley, Esq.
Rev. W. Shrewsbury
William Taylor, Esq.
William Thompson, Esq.
Benjamin Wilson, Esq.

NEWCASTLE.

Anthony Atkinson, Esq.
Thomas Cargill, Esq.
William Cargill, Esq.
Armorer Donkin, Esq.
Thomas Dunn, Esq.
Benjamin Gilpin, Esq.
Joshua Johnson, Esq.
John Lee, Esq.
Robert Ormston, Esq.
Jonath Priestman, Esq.

BIRMINGHAM.

R. T. Cadbury, Esq.
R. Lucas Chance, Esq.
James Drake, Esq.
B. Hudson, Esq.
Dr. Edw. Johnson, M.D.
G. P. Lloyd, Esq.
John Rubery, Esq.
J. Sturge, Esq., 2 copies
John Webster, Esq.

LEICESTER.

William Biggs, Esq.
Alfred Burgess, Esq.
Thomas Burgess, Esq.
Thos. Edw. Blunt, Esq.
Josiah Cripps, Esq.
Edw. Shipley Ellis, Esq.
Isaac Hodgson, Esq.
Dr. J. W. Noble.
Samuel Waters, Esq.

BOLTON.

Rev. Franklin Baker.
J. R. Barnes, Esq.
Benj. Hick, Esq. 2 copies
Robert Heywood, Esq.
Peter Rothwell, Esq.
Thomas Thomason, Esq.

IPSWICH.

R. D. Alexander, Esq.
J. M. Burton, Esq.
Thomas Clarkson, Esq.
A Friend
James Ransome, Esq.
Robert Ransome, Esq.
J. T. Shewell, Esq.

NORWICH.

Henry Birkbeck, Esq.
Joseph Jno. Gurney, Esq.
Mrs. Amelia Opie
Miss Anna Gurney
Mrs. Catherine Gurney

UXBRIDGE.

John Hull, Esq.
Samuel Hull, Esq.
Joseph Rutter, Esq.
Charles Rutter, Esq.
Thomas Smith, Esq.
W. F. Smith, Esq.

TODMORDEN.

James Fielden, Esq.
Joshua B. Fielden, Esq.
John Hill, Esq.
William Howarth, Esq.
John Veers, Esq.

COLEBROOKE DALE.

Rev. John Bartlett
Richard Darby, Esq.
Abraham Darby, Esq.
Alfred Darby, Esq.
Mrs. Lucy Darby
Barnard Dickenson, Esq.
Henry Dickenson, Esq.—
2 copies
D. D. Gourlay, Esq. M.D.
Thomas Grahame, Esq.
George Pritchard, Esq.

PORTSMOUTH.

Admiral Sir Geo. Barker,
K.C.B.
Adml. Sir E. Codrington,
G.C.B. F.R.S.
Vice-Adml. Sir T. Baker,
K.C.B.
Rear-Admiral the Hon.
D. P. Bouverie

Thomas Ellyett, Esq.
Captain Gourlay, R.N.

BRISTOL.

L. Bewsey, Esq.
Robert Charlton, Esq.
Joseph Eaton, Esq.
Edward Humpage, Esq.
Henry Hunt, Esq.
William Knowles, Esq.
Mrs. G. Moody, Petherton
W. H. Somerton, Esq.
Edward Thomas, Esq.
George Thomas, Esq.
Elijah Waring, Esq.

BATH.

H. F. Cotterell, Esq.
Miss Sarah Hoare
Miss Owen
Rev. T. Spencer, Hinton
J. Pavin, Esq.
Teetotal Reading Room
STAFF. POTTERIES.
G. R. Booth, Esq.
Francis Morley, Esq.
Edward J. Ridgway, Esq.
John Ridgway, Esq.
William Ridgway, Esq.

NOTTINGHAM.

Charles H. Clarke, Esq.
Alderman Frearson
Samuel Fox, Esq.
George Gill, Esq.
J. C. Higginbottom, Esq.

EXETER.

Henry Janson, Esq.
William Kenuaway, Esq.
Barnfield
Ed. Macgowen, Esq. M.D.
Joseph B. Sanders, Esq.
Mrs. Susan Smith, Penn-
sylvania
Henry Sparkes, Esq.
Mrs. Sarah Sparkes
Capt. Tanner, E.I.C.S.

TAUNTON.

M. Blake, Esq. M.D.
James Bunter, Esq.
Rich. Meade, King, Esq.
Rbt. Kinglake, Esq. M.D.
Henry James Leigh, Esq.
John W. Warren, Esq.
John Young, Esq.

BIDEFORD.

John Pickard, Esq.
Major Wren
Charles Carter, Esq.
Thomas Vellacott, Esq.

LEEDS.

Robert Arthington, Esq.
Edw. Baines, jun., Esq.
George Goodman, Esq.
James Holdforth, Esq.
Robert Jowitt, Esq.
Joshua Kaye, Esq.
Charles Makins, Esq.
James G. Marshall, Esq.
Hatton Stansfield, Esq.
John Waddingham, Esq.
John Wilkinson, Esq.
George Wise, Esq.

WAKEFIELD.

George Benington, Esq.
Daniel Gaskell, Esq.
G. W. Harrison, Esq.
Rev. T. Johnstone
William Leatham, Esq.

DONCASTER.

W. Aldam, Esq.
William Chadwick, Esq.
Sir Francis L. Wood, Bart.

BRIGHTON.

R. Patching, Esq.
J. Williams, Esq.
Literary Institution
Captain S. Hardman, 10th
Hussars.

CHELTENHAM.

C. Hale Jessop, Esq.
T. Dawson, Esq.
T. L. Townsend, Esq.
John D. Tagart, Esq.
G. A. Williams, Esq.

FALMOUTH.

R. Weir, Fox, Esq.
Mrs. Millar
Phil. Richards, Esq.
R. S. Sutton, Esq.

READING.

William Exall, Esq.
George Lovejoy, Esq.
Richard Webb, Esq.
John Weedon, Esq.

PRESTON.

Thomas Copeland, Esq.
Thomas German, Esq.
Isaac Wilcockson, Esq.

CHESTER.

N. Wardell, Esq., Mayor
T. Davies, Esq., M.D.
Thomas B. Peacock, Esq.

CHIPPENHAM.

Charles Bayliffe, Esq.
Daniel Rawlings, Esq.
William Wilmot, Esq.

SHERBORNE.

W. Dinglay, Esq.
John Gray, Esq.
John Penny, Esq.

WORCESTER.

Fred. Thos. Elgie, Esq.
Robert Hardy, Esq.
Richard Padmore, Esq.
Henry Stone, Esq.

HEREFORD.

Charles Anthony, Esq.
Nath. Kyrle Collins, Esq.
Nathaniel Morgan, Esq.
C. Spozzi, Esq.

SUNDERLAND.

William Bell, Esq.
Caleb Richardson, Esq.
Sir Cuthbert Sharp, Bart.
Andrew White, Esq.
R. White, Esq.

ACKWORTH.

Luke Howard, Esq.

WAKEFIELD.

S. Holdsworth, Esq.

EDINBURGH.

Advocates' Library
Rev. Christ. Anderson
College Library
George Coombe, Esq.
A. Cruickshank, Esq.—
2 copies
John Dunlop, Esq.
James Gray, Esq., N.B.A.
Major-General Pitman.
B. Scott, Esq.
James Simpson, Esq.
Alexander Young, Esq.

GLASGOW.

The Lord Provost.
Kirkman Finlay, Esq.
Robert Grahame, Esq.,
of Whitehill
Robert Hutchinson, Esq.
Robert Kettle, Esq.
William P. Paton, Esq.
Thos. M. Thompson, Esq.

DUBLIN.

His Excellency the Lord
Lieutenant of Ireland.
Rt. Hon. the Lord Chanc-
ellor of Ireland
John Classon, Esq.
Arthur Guinness, Esq.
James Haughton, Esq.
Dr. Harvey
Rev. Sir Harcourt Lees
Vice-Admiral R.D. Oliver

CORK.

Rev. Theobald Matthew,
President of the Tempe-
rance Society—2 copies
Rev. F. Trestraill

And 130 others in the smaller Towns.

NOTICES FROM REVIEWS.

Literary Gazette.—"It is a very entire and comprehensive view of the United States, diligently collected by a man of observation."

Athenæum.—"While others have been content to give in general summaries the results of their observations, Mr. Buckingham goes deliberately through the States, treating of all, historically and statistically—of their rise and progress, their manufactures, trade, population, topography, fertility, resources, morals, manners, education, and so forth. *Mr. Buckingham's volumes will be found a storehouse of knowledge.*"

The Sun.—"His volumes, the result of three years' close and patient observation, are worthy of every attention, and certainly furnish us with the clearest ideas we have yet had of the present aspects of society in the United States."

Bristol Journal.—"Mr. Buckingham's work, we do not hesitate to state, appears to contain by far the most voluminous, extensive, and amusing history of the United States in the three characters, 'historical, statistic, and descriptive,' that has yet been published."

East India Telegraph.—"In Mr. Buckingham's America, the public possesses one of the most *generally* interesting works, descriptive of the New World, which has ever emanated from the press. The extensive geographical range of the country traversed by our experienced traveller—the multiplicity of subjects which have occupied his pen—his agreeable style of composition—the ability and tact with which he has blended historical and statistical matter with bright delineations of manners and customs, the general topics dwelt on in cities and states—and, especially, the philanthropic purpose, in the prosecution of which Mr. Buckingham has gathered the stores of knowledge enumerated—combine to produce a book of travels containing literary *ana* unsurpassed for novelty, comprehensiveness, and interest, by any extant work."

Sheffield Independent.—"We have seen enough of the work to ascertain that it fully realizes the high anticipations which our knowledge of Mr. Buckingham, as an author, as a man of most varied information, and of great acuteness, had induced us to form. He writes in a spirit of candour and honesty. He neither flatters America at the expense of England, nor England at the expense of America, but draws his contrasts between the morality, the intelligence, the manners, and the habits of the two countries, in that spirit of fairness which alone can give value to such comparisons."

Bristol Mercury.—"Mr. Buckingham, too, did not 'steam' it through the country, and write 'flying sketches,' caught from the decks of steam-boats, or from the windows of railway carriages, the manners, habits, and customs of the people being picked up exclusively from the conversation of passengers by those modes of conveyance: but he took up his abode in the principal towns for months together. The result has been a work, not written to support any political or preconceived theory, and, in fact not dealing much in disquisitions or inferences, but comprising a vast mass of most valuable and interesting information, presented to the reader in a clear, unaffected, and judicious manner."

Bath Journal.—"Mr. Buckingham gives full scope to his powerful mind in his America—he makes his work attractive to the millions by a detail of every circumstance which tends to show the character of the people he has to describe. We may now say that America is more ably and more impartially described than has yet been her fate; and we sincerely trust that all national prejudices have the axe laid to their roots, and that they will give place to a new spirit, which will bring both nations into a more intimate connection, and extend the interchange of commercial advantages, among the people both of America and Great Britain."

Liverpool Albion.—"He, however, deals not in dry details, but conducts his readers with him in a plain and business-like manner, bestowing upon them, *en passant*, the richness of his well-stored mind. Describing events and occurrences as they actually took place, noting everything that met his view, of habit, manner, and character, the appearance of cities, and aspect of countries, with the accuracy of one possessed of a trained eye and understanding. By introducing us to all objects worthy of notice, and in the direct order in which such objects came under his own observation, he almost realizes to ourselves the scenes of his travel, and, as we visit the edifices and public institutions which he examined, we are enabled to form a correct notion of the customs of our brethren of the United States in many particulars which other travellers have overlooked or deemed unworthy of attention."

Scotsman.—"We have always suspected the eulogiums of American writers on the eloquence of their public speakers, to be, if not wholly unmerited, at least absurdly extravagant; but we do not recollect to have met with any remarks in any work on America, till we read Mr. Buckingham's, calculated to give us something like positive and correct information on this subject. Numerous as the works on America already are, *there is not one* which we should, for various reasons, so unhesitatingly recommend, as this of Mr. Buckingham's."

Plymouth Herald.—"These volumes contain a fund of knowledge on every subject connected with America: its rise and progress; the education, manners, and merits of its inhabitants; its manufactures, trade, population, &c.; in fact, no subject of importance is left untouched. It is quite refreshing to peruse the sensible and sterling remarks of this writer, after what has recently teemed from the press on the United States of America. This work is a valuable addition to the standard literature of the age."

Edinburgh Evening Courant.—"Some travellers have exalted everything American as above all praise; while others have found nothing in the institutions and manners of that country but food for caricature. Mr. Buckingham, however, steers a middle course, *he is perfectly candid and impartial*; he is no indiscriminate panegyrist of America, nor does he satirize either her institutions or manners, but seems to distribute blame and praise with perfect fairness."

Liverpool Chronicle.—"The circumstances of Mr. Buckingham's life qualify him, above others, to present to the English reader a faithful and striking transcript of the social, commercial, literary, and political character of our transatlantic neighbours. His work contains features of a pleasing kind, peculiar to itself. Whether regarded as a work of instruction, amusement, or as a mere political treatise, it is a production of great merit and unquestionable utility."

Morning Herald.—"There are few men, in this age of adventure and exertion, whose intellectual labours and researches have been more extensive and varied, and have embraced a wider range over the globe, than Mr. Buckingham. His public labours extend over our Colonial possessions, and large portions of the Eastern and Western worlds. For the present we would direct public attention to the very important work on America which he has now published. Of his qualifications for the task he has undertaken, and of his literary acquirements, it may suffice to say, that he possesses a thorough knowledge of trade and commerce, in all their multifarious departments, has had great experience of the world, united to literary powers of observation and narration of the highest order, speaks fluently many ancient and a great number of modern languages, and the list of his published works is such in extent as perhaps no man living has produced."

FISHER, SON, & CO., NEWGATE-STREET, LONDON.

HISTORICAL MEMORIALS

RELATING TO THE

INDEPENDENTS,

OR

CONGREGATIONALISTS:

FROM THEIR RISE

TO THE RESTORATION OF THE MONARCHY,

A.D. MDC LX.

R BY BENJAMIN HANBURY.

VOLUME II.

"FROM THIS HISTORICAL RELATION OF OUR PRACTICES, THERE MAY A TRUE ESTIMATE BE TAKEN OF OUR OPINIONS IN DIFFERENCE; WHICH BEING INSTANCED IN, AND SET OUT BY PRACTICES, IS THE MOST REAL AND LEAST COLLUSIVE WAY, AND CARRIES ITS OWN EVIDENCE WITH IT."

APOLOGETICAL NARRATION, 1643.

LONDON;

PRINTED FOR

THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND AND WALES.

FISHER, SON, & CO., NEWGATE STREET.

AND JACKSON AND WALFORD, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD.

1841.

HISTORICAL MEMORIALS

INDEXED

AND

CONTENTS

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

LONDON

THE

LONDON: FISHER, SON, AND CO., PRINTERS

ANNOUNCEMENT.

FROM the success that has attended diligent research, the documentary matters for the completion of these Memorials have accumulated beyond expectation.

The increased historic value and interest thus acquired, relates more especially to the period in which the practical application of the principles of Congregationalists was being tested in the territory of New England; and while the principles themselves were undergoing those sifting discussions for which the debates of the great Assembly of Divines at Westminster are peculiarly distinguished.

In order, therefore, to the furnishing an adequate amount of the indispensable records of those affairs, it has been decided, with the entire concurrence of the

ANNOUNCEMENT.

Committee of the Congregational Union, not to diminish the permanent value of the rest by the exclusion of these portions of the documents.

Such are the circumstances constituting the ground of this Appeal. It is made with confidence to the Subscribers at large, for their approval of the extension of the Memorials beyond what was originally stipulated; under which further encouragement, all the despatch that the nature of the undertaking allows, will be used to expedite the appearance of a third and concluding volume.

SEPTEMBER, 1841.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

CHAPTER XXXIV.—Temp. CHARLES I. Continued.

HEYLYN'S ANSWER TO BURTON.—MILTON'S PROPHECY.

PAGE 1.—Heylyn characterized by some Churchmen—Increase and effect of Pamphlets—"Dictator" Burton, gives Laud a Counterbuff—Terror Burton began to excite—Is answered, by Authority—Heylyn's supercilious commencement—Proceeds with an insult, and commits a blunder—Brings his Dialectics into play—Why he places the High Commission foremost—Wherein unconstitutional; and whose the imperishable glory of opposing it—Heylyn's next grievance—Defames anti-tyrannical doctrines—Admits that Prelates gave unlimited power to kings—Illustrates it—Kings hold no otherwise than *Dei gratia*!—Priests use Kings as their tools—Instanced, in King James—Again, in King Charles—Sycophancy—Heylyn now charges those who refused to read the Book of Sports, with making Conscience only a pretence; and imputes broader designs against them—The Case of those Suspended, in the Diocese of Norwich, adduced by him—He asserts that Six only, not Sixty, were absolutely Suspended there—And Eight only, where rumour made eighty—Confuted, by Laud's and Wren's own showing—Again, by Wren's Defence on his Impeachment—State of his Diocese generally—Burton's statements mainly established—Remark upon that result—Heylyn proceeds to Innovations—His case—Refuted—Cavilling—Evasions resorted to—His Conclusion, by way of Condescension!—Milton describes the secular Clergy, and announces a Catastrophe—Developed.

CHAP. XXXV.

NINE POSITIONS SENT TO NEW ENGLAND.—ANSWER.—REPLY.

Page 18.—Jealousy of the Puritans towards their emancipated Brethren—Their Letter opens with general Imputations—The New England Tenets spread at Home—Uneasiness of the Puritans thereat—Invite particulars—Premonition—Benediction—Remark, introductory to the Answer of the Elders in New England—They commence with acknowledging that they had reviewed their Principles—Their Practice altered with their Position: and why—Plan and Grounds of their Answer explained; with a gentle Reproof for Censoriousness—Rigid Separation not justified; but Progress in Reformation insisted upon—Their Benediction—Remarks upon their Letter, and explanation of their Treatise and the Reply to it—The Nine Positions, *seriatim*.

CHAP. XXXVI.

LAUD'S EXILES.—LILBURNE.—ABBOT.—BALL.—LAUD'S CANONS.—RETURN OF HIS VICTIMS, BURTON, ETC.

Page 39.—Concerning Lecturers; how regulated.—Their restrictions induced People and Ministers to depart the Kingdom: among whom were those Five who afterwards attained to peculiar notoriety—Lilburne characterized—Title of one of his boldest Treatises—His grounds of Separation—His Challenge—How to be conducted—Posterity his debtors, immensely—Abbot, against Church-Forsakers—Gives to the word Separation, an attractive power—Fulsome Invocation—His reason why the name Brownists rejected—Undesigned Concession—Ball's Friendly Trial—A Clerical dictum counter-vailed—Of his Thesis denying the seat of Power to be in all the Faithful—Paragraph affirmative—Stricture upon it—Specimens of weakness, or incon-

clusive reasoning—The Convocation, sit illegally—R. Hooker's Presage of the Church's decline evidenced—Laud, unrelenting—Parliament—They act against the Ecclesiastics summarily—Triumphant return of two of Laud's victims—A Committee of Investigation of Sixty Members, appointed without delay—Prynne's Petition—Burton's and Bastwick's—Particulars, instanced in Burton's Cause—Retribution against the Prelates, advocated—Laud's downfall depicted—Manifestation of God's Justice—Clarendon's party-coloured representation; and Hall's testimony of the increasing disaffection from the State-Church.

CHAP. XXXVII.

THE SCOTS' DEPUTATION.—CANNE.—PAGET.—DAVENPORT.—DEADMAN'S PLACE.

Page 55.—Announcement—Scottish Self-Sufficiency—Design, first and last, of the Plotting Scots—Foresight of the Separatists—Position of all the Religious Parties—"Sion's Prerogative"—John Paget's "Defence"—Cheshire Remonstrance—Canne's assiduity against Classes—Paget stirred up by Ainsworth—His first instance upset by a *non sequitur*—He uses *argumentum ad hominem* against Canne—An assumption, and a declaration, invalidated—Davenport's Rejoinder to Paget—Reasons of its late appearance: and, The two pillar-principles of the Congregational Way—The Charter of a Scriptural Church—The material Cause—The formal Cause—Congregational—Stability—The "Keys"—Entireness of Jurisdiction—A mistake adduced, in Matt. xviii.—The greater of two evils, Classical Jurisdiction—A public occurrence announced—Official Particulars—Explanation—This Congregation of Independents had subsisted above twenty-four years—A Date ascertained—The Site named, geographically laid down.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

THE COMMONS' PROTESTATION.—BURTON.—GEREE.

Page 68.—What occasioned the Protestation—Burton's "Protestation Protested:" Effect on Richard Baxter—View of Burton's Argument—Replied to by a Presbyterian—The excitement Burton's piece had occasioned, proved—Its title objected against—An alleged Fallacy, strangely treated of—Remark upon it—Another strange specimen—Geree's Presbyterian predilections decomposed—His idea of a National Church—Oversight respecting the parable of the Tares—Miscellany—An acceptable Prayer.

CHAP. XXXIX.

SURVEY OF BURTON'S PROTESTATION PROTESTED.—HIS SERMON ON LUKE ix. 23.

Page 83.—The Presbyterian, succeeded by a furious Episcopalian—Prefatory announcement—The Onset—Notice—The Instrument, "the Whip"—Taunt, for having cited Antiquity—Vinegar, administered—Conscience, contemned—Personal insult, continued—Main battle began—"Imposition;" that it renders Prayers burdensome—Parliament, descanted upon—Liturgy caressed—Ceremonies—Discipline—Bishops—Consistories—Separation, contumeliously treated of—Of the godly communicating with a profane "brother," 1 Cor. v. 11—Churches, how reduced to Families—A Paragon of a Reviler—Loyalty, impeached—State supremacy—Perfection, jeered at—Confusion, arraigned—Reformation; what, and when to be finished?—Independent and not Independent—Hint, in the Conclusion, that the Politicians add fuel to the dissensions among the Reformers—Title of Burton's Sermon in a time of the Plague—His doctrine, Self-denial—Its application.

CHAP. XL.

LETTER TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—ANSWER.—T. EDWARDS.—CHIDLEY.

Page 97.—The Puritans entered actively upon the struggle for Ecclesiastical Supremacy—Their Letter for Succour—Answer of the General Assembly—Edwards enters into the Strife, with his "Reasons"—Of his strong Resolutions—He and his Presbyterian brethren mistrust their temporary Enjoyment—His dread of Independency—Endeavours to Obstruct Petitions for Toleration—His first eight "Reasons," *seriatim*—He brags—Of his other "Reasons"—His preventive, Intolerance—What he affirms, to prejudice Independents;

and what he admits, showing their superiority—How New England came to be partially imbued with Anti-toleration—Independents, semi-separatists—Success of Toleration, hereafter—Edwards's simplicity—His spleen—The Commons discountenance Toleration, as yet—Edwards, self-satisfied—He is stamp'd by Milton—His humiliating position, through a Female Antagonist—She jeers at the fate of Edwards's forlorn-hope—He is caught next by an ambush—He is now held at bay—Assaulted, positively—Negatively—Conditionally—Still successfully repelled—She hoists her standard above his—A thrust at Priests—Limits of Authority—Christ's Crown, maintained—A home-thrust—Further light into the cause of Inconsistency, in New England—Of Edwards's Dependency—The burden of all Ecclesiastical Imposts, how doubled upon all not of the Established Church—Her Priests impoverished, wherefore—Her whole Worship, said to be unlawful—Defects, acknowledged—Compulsion—Avarice of Parish-priests—Their Exactions—Price of Absolutions; their abomination—The Smoke-penny—Church-cormorants—Persecution, instigated by Priests—Edwards and his brethren, how like Issachar's ass—Persecution, still pressed against them—Effects of Persecution upon the outward conduct of the subjects—Edwards's spiritual Fatherhood, challenged—He is rallied for a Goliath—A parley proposed.

CHAP. XLI.

THE LORDS BROOKE AND SAY.

Page 117.—Introduction to Milton's panegyric on Brooke—The passage, quoted—Title of Brooke's Discourse—Adjuncts to a Scripture-Bishop—Rise of the adulterate Bishop—Analytic process, stated—This kind of Bishop, whence he springs—Sarcastic stroke at the "Congé d'elire"—Official maxims—Unreasonable—Practice, agreeing—Nothing 'Indifferent,' in reality—Church's Power, defined—Reason, contradicted; and Conscience forced—Consequents upon "our Bishop's office;" dependence—Past Obligations; future Favours—His freedom, in Parliament, incredible—His evil qualities, in Civil converse—Pride, and abasement—"No Bishop, no King;" State-blasphemy—Insolence, practised—Instances, adduced—Progress, through successive Reigns—Doctrine—Church-Monarchy, a human device—Of Force—Episcopacy, not the only Church policy that may co-exist with Monarchy—"Our Episcopacy," condemned—God's rule, for Election and Ordination—All-sufficiency of the Scriptures—Hall's defence of Episcopacy, evades the point—Of Matt. xviii. 17—Queries—Solution, first—Second—Third—The Whole Church, the Everything—Prelates, the real Schismatics—Whence the increase of Nonconformists—To know the Separatists, hear them—Beautiful description of vital godliness, and how it is reproached—Operations of the Holy Spirit—Peace, invoked—Brooke's compatriot, Say, his two Speeches; the first, for the reduction of Bishops to their original standard—The common Incendiaries of the Christian world—Say's Second Speech; its origin and effect—The Exordium—Rise and progress of Laud; his invective against Say—Say begins to vindicate himself—His Retorts, on the charge of not attending Prayers—Enjoined Prayer, a usurpation, a device of man—An acceptable service, illustrated—Enjoined Preaching, or Reading, not God's ordinance—"A theological scare-crow," Hales of Eton's charge against the Hierarchy for setting up—Error of the "Brownists"—Freedom of worship implored.

CHAP. XLII.

STRAFFORD.—VOTE OF JULY 16TH, 1641.—BAGSHAW.—WHITE.—THE BISHOPS' FATAL PROTESTATION.—THE AFFAIR OF THE FIVE MEMBERS.—ACT TO EXCLUDE THE BISHOPS.—ORDINANCE CONTEMPLATING THE ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES.—REMONSTRANCE OF MAY 26TH, 1642.—BOOK OF SPORTS, ETC.—CHARLES'S ADDRESS TO THE HOSTS.—GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—CATALOGUE OF GRIEVANCES.—POSITION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Page 137.—Beheading of Strafford; its effect upon other State culprits; a poetical dialogue between Strafford and Laud—Vote, to Reform Episcopal Government—Sixteen Particulars—Remarks, introductory to the title of Bagshawe's "Two Arguments"—Heylyn's account of Bagshawe's Readings,

at the Temple—Bagshawe's own account—Who the chief conflicting Parties; a result foreseen, but not the catastrophe — The illegality of the New Canons charged—Opposed to Common Law—Opposed to the spirit of Magna Charta—These Canons void, from legal irregularity—Also, in themselves—The Oath, how otherwise nullified—Wherein it Overthrows the King's Supremacy—And, sets aside the King himself—Crafty substitution of "See" for "Church" of Rome—Grounds of illegality, recapitulated—Remarks—The Penalty incurred, by the Clergy—A Premunire—Defined—Its rigour, the consequence of perpetual encroachment by the Clergy—Chancellor Audley's rebuff, concerning the Bishops—Their Jus Divinum claim of Jurisdiction, not admitted—Epigrammatic conclusion—White's description of the Bishops' usurpations—Hall tries to implicate the King—The Bishops' miscarriage, when they had wrought the popular rage to its height—Make their presence necessary to the integrity of Parliaments—Excluded by Act—The King's alleged "unadvised" rashness, and its consequences related—He passes the Bill for excluding all persons in "Holy Orders" from Parliament, and further disabling them—The two Houses make an Ordinance declaratory of a Reformation of the Church—And avow the Popular basis of the British Constitution—The King hoists his Standard—The Commons' Vote to suppress the Book of Sports, with other Ecclesiastical innovations—The King, on the field, denounces his "enemies," specifically—The Parliament under apprehensions, confer with the General Assembly—They put forth afresh the Catalogue of Grievances; which increases dissension—They show their superiority, under the peculiarities of the times.

CHAP. XLIII.

COTTON'S CONSTITUTION OF A CHURCH.—HIS ANSWER TO BALL.—BREWSTER.

Page 154.—Circumstances under which Cotton transmitted his Manuscripts—This of the True Constitution, etc., declares his sentiments, of the mode of conducting Public Worship—Of Church Government—Of the Power inherent in the Church, derived through the body to the officers—Title of Cotton's Answer to Ball—Prayer, in general; how it becomes lawful—Positions stated and explained: necessity and expediency of Prescribed Prayer, argued—No parallel can be reasonably drawn between reading the Scriptures and reading Prayers—A shifting of the question, to argue from Prayers devised by Men to those prescribed by God, or conversely—Necessity of set words for harmonious Singing, no plea for imposed Prayer—Of Godly Helps to Prayer—Why the intrusions upon Churches, of magistrates, ought to be resisted—Of Catechisms and Confessions—Lawful Prayer; when, a will-worship; a difference between the Word read and preached—The Jews, and Christ, afford no authority for imposing set Forms, by example—Reformed foreign Churches, their liberty: Truth to be sought out; not to be taken for granted—Unlawful administrations, to be withdrawn from—Remarks on another of Cotton's pieces—Death of William Brewster—Account of him.

CHAP. XLIV.

CONTROVERSY BY HERLE; R. MATHER AND W. THOMPSON; RUTHERFURD; MATHER.

Page 166.—"The Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches," appears—Herle's frankness—Co-ordinated dependence, affirmed by him—His four points—Of the pattern of the Jewish church—Of Christ's institution—A position; remarked on—Of the Apostles' practice—Of a Ministerial Institution—The argument, not progressed in—Entreaty, resorted to—Mather and Thompson, answer Herle—Why they undertook that—No Synod is a Church—Not less than seven, a Church—Instance, of Acts xv. defective—A concession by Herle, taken advantage of—Enforced—Argument from divers sorts of Synods, invalidates the whole—That "tell the Church," means tell the Elders; draws not the precept beyond a particular Congregation—Argument enlarged, from appeals of one National Church to another—A remark, nullified—A dilemma, deduced from Acts xv.—Another, from Num. viii. 10—When "imposition of hands" is to be performed by Non-

officers—Elders existed before any Classis or Synod; whence no concurrence, in the first Ordination of Elders—Choice of Ministers, if not by the Church; what perplexities ensue—The Answerer's conclusion—Notice of Strictures on the foregoing joint "Answer," by Rutherford; and the "Answer" defended, by Mather—How disputes are beneficial—Number of Rutherford's citations—His argument for "appealing," wherein prejudicial—Further perplexity—Power to determine, instanced in Antioch—Of a power beyond "rebuking;" and of what is any "assembly" where preaching is?—Doctrine, dispensed by the Pastor; discipline, by the Church—Where does "supremacy" lie?—Antioch's right, how inferred—Competency of three Elders to decide—Discipline or Sacraments, which the greater—All Churches, have equal authority—That, by the light of nature—Paul Baynes, of the Churches at Thessalonica and Jerusalem—Those at Corinth, Ephesus, and Antioch, each but one Congregation. The alleged Synod at Cambridge, N. E.—Thomas Fuller—The Eldership alone, not a Church—No New Testament record, that ordinary Pastors or Elders imposed hands on ordinary Pastors, etc.—Election, essential; and so, more than the rite of Ordination—Scripture tells what the *Presbytery* did to Timothy, but not what *he* must do with one.

CHAP. XLV.

FERNE AND BRIDGE ON RESISTANCE.—BOOK OF SPORTS BURNT.—ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES CALLED.—THEIR ADDRESS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.—THE FIVE DISSENTING BRETHREN.

Page 188.—Moral heroism, timely evinced—Ferne and Bridge, in collision—Bridge importuned to write on Civil Government—Bases of the argument—Power springs from the People, and returns to them—Justice Fortescue cited—Three grounds stated for the Parliament arming—Testimonies, for Resistance—Scripture, animadverted upon—Bridge's principle of Toleration, finally announced—"His Majesty's Book," burned by the Hangman—Title of the Ordinance for an Assembly of Divines—The Ordinance—Heylyn's account of it—They and the Parliament communicate with Scotland—Particulars—Foresight, and skilful conduct, of Nye and Vane—Speedy approval of the Covenant—Heylyn's description of its Enforcement—First two Articles of the Covenant—The King prohibits it—Abuse bestowed on the Westminster Assembly—The Five; or, The Anti-Scotia Phalanx.

CHAP. XLVI.

SIMPSON'S FAST SERMON.—NYE'S EXHORTATION.—THE SCOTS' COMMISSIONERS.—BAILLIE'S DISCLOSURES.—OF MIXT COMMUNION.

Page 205.—Title of Simpson's Sermon—His Exhortation to the House of Commons—Text, etc.—Nye's Discourse before reading the Covenant in the presence of the Commons and the Assembly—Design of it—Against Popery—Against Prelacy—What Baillie represents to be its chief aim; and, when the Commissioners joined the Assembly—The debate of the office of Doctors, and Ruling Elders—The Scots begin to intrigue with Foreigners—Temporary procedure towards the Independents—Tracts on Mixt Communions.

CHAP. XLVII.

THE FAMOUS APOLOGETICAL NARRATION.—THE SAINTS' APOLOGY.

Page 221.—Preamble; and the Title of the "Narration"—Disinterested conduct of the Licensor—The Apologists address themselves to the Parliament—Why they went into Exile—Their purpose—Found more Peace abroad, but less Godliness than at home—Their Advantages, from Predecessors—And, Encouragement, from their expatriated Brethren—Their special Resolution—Their Charity—Order of their Worship—Officers—Discipline—Three Principles; New Testament Churches, their pattern; present judgment, not binding, absolutely; not to reject any, even the meanest member of Christ—Free Prayer, preferred—Each Church, Congregational—Their Eldership—Of Communion of Sister Churches, and Suspension of such Communion—Of the Magistrates' interposing power—Strictures on "Exemption" from extrinsic authority—These Apologists adopt "a Middle Way"—Complain

of Calumnies—Their Moderation—Conduct, in the Assembly—Solicit of the Parliament, Protection.—“The Saints’ Apology”—Publisher’s explanation—The Writer’s plan—His Definition of a Church—The Matter of it—The Form of it—Advantage of an Explicit Consent, or Covenant—Reason for Separation—The term explained two ways—Why necessary, in England—Argument, from restraining Free Prayer, to restraining the Gift of Teaching—Duty of Members, individually—Argument, from analogy—Exactness, disclaimed—H. Jacob’s “fancy.”

CHAP. XLVIII.

ANATOMY OF INDEPENDENCY.—THE ANATOMIST ANATOMISED.—QUERIES.—OBSERVATIONS, ETC., BY A. S.

Page 238.—Agitation produced by the Five—The “Anatomy,” by Alexander Forbes—Reverberates the Apologists’ “noise”—Whence that “noise” had been heard—Forbes’s rule of judgment on the Apologists—His “scantling” of their sayings and doings—Supposed instigators—Their aversion from any National Church—His susceptibility to perceive a Stratagem—His allegation that the Apologists practised Re-ordination—His representation concerning their churches in Holland—His hearsay of Simpson’s idea of a Pastor—His statement of Simpson’s judgment of Ruling Elders—Somewhat that the Apologists complain of respecting the imputation of Brownism—Of the efficacy of their Excommunication of Churches—Title of Simpson’s Answer to Forbes—Of this particular Controversy—False report of the constituents of Simpson’s church—And of Anabaptists in it—Retort of “Errors” upon other than Congregational churches—Proof that Simpson had Protection from the State of Rotterdam; honourable alike to them and to him—Another false report, respecting “a mutual Covenant”—A flat contradiction to Forbes’ hearsay concerning Simpson’s practice as a Pastor—Again, Forbes is contradicted respecting Ruling Elders—Simpson invokes impartial justice—Queries Proposed; Anonymous—Disadvantage of Licensers—Both sets of Disputants watched—Consequence of voting the Bishops antichristian—A higher standard of Religion sought for—The Assembly of Divines impugned—The Civil Magistrate’s province and safeguard—The Church’s foundation spiritual—Reformation, is not in Formalities—Of more or less of Reformation—Purity and Independence of Christ’s churches—Forcible proposition concerning universal Toleration—Of Witnesses for Christ—The *argumentum ad hominem* applied to both sets of Reformers—A dilemma, out of the Sacraments—Amplitude of Toleration required—A State Church, an aggregate of Evils—Full title of “Some Observations,” etc., by Adam Steuart—The Imprimatur—The author’s vexation at the “Five” combining—And that, against the Scots particularly—Anecdote of James I.—A. S. betrays surprise at the Apologists—Charges them with accommodating themselves to the occasion—He turns a coxer—Impeaches their sincerity—Singularity of his logic—Collection of his taunts.

CHAP. XLIX.

BAILLIE.—COTTON’S “KEYS.”—“SION’S VIRGINS.”

Page 254.—Finesse exposed—Again—Baillie’s report of certain proceedings; and his apprehension of the Independents’ power in the Assembly—T. Goodwin opposes the Directory—Baillie plots with Spang—Consternation produced by the Apologetical Narration—Artifice resorted to—Expedients regarding Ordination—They fail—Assembly heat—Independents, unmanageable—Aspect of Public affairs—Title of Cotton’s treatise on the “Keys”—The Power of, claimed by the Publishers, for the right heirs—The Key of Knowledge, its effects—Too much Power claimed for the People—Equitable adjustment of it—As in Commonwealths—The will of Christ imagined—Cotton’s distribution of Church-power, set out—His scheme, or theory—Asserted to be the very “Middle-way” of the Apologists—This coincidence remarked upon—Of Prophesying, under four cautions—And, of a formal Synod—The People’s interest, and the Elders’ authority, illustrated—A combination of Elders of several churches, why not intrusted with the Key of Discipline—Remark of the Publishers—Cotton’s first chapter, What the

Keys, etc. be—His second, Of their Distribution—His third, Assignment of those of Knowledge and Order—His fourth, Of the Key of Church-Privilege—His fifth, Of the Key of Authority—His sixth, Of the Power given to Synods—His seventh, Touching the First Subject of all Power; with an explanation of Independency.—“Sion’s Virgins,” Queries on Baptism—It is not the Creature going in and out of Water—That Infants are of the Kingdom—The mode of Baptizing—Distinction between the Seals under the Gospel.

CHAP. L.

PURITAN TRACT, EDITED BY RATHBAND.—[JOHNSON.]

Page 272.—Title, “A Most Grave and Modest Confutation, etc.”—Quotation from Baxter, concerning it—Rathband’s statement of its origination—Why produced then—Cautionary remark—Charges against the Brownists, etc., set down, as justifying themselves, by the Puritan Writers of this Tract—Separatists, addressed—And then, Waverers—Next, Puritans—Lastly, their Church—Excusatory appeal—Length, apologised for—The divisions of the Treatise—“Brownist” objection, against the “Puritans” *in limine*—Defence by a perverse application of the term “Anti-christian”—Remarkable concessions regarding the necessity of Ordination—Equivocation about Oaths—Maintenance, curiously vindicated—And, in four other paragraphs—Scripture places, or references, alleged to be unskilful—These Puritans’ infelicitous Conclusion; instances from—Their testimony against themselves—Two queries, instanced—Their accusation, of shameful Lying, confuted—Their spirit, sufficiently exposed.—Johnson’s Treatise of the Ministry of the Church of England—Proofs of the authorship—Popish and English Priests, wherein they agree; and wherein they differ from Pastors appointed by Christ—Confirmed, under thirty-three divisions.

CHAP. LI.

RATHBAND AND HIS OPPONENT, WELDE.

Page 289.—Remark on the course pursued in these Historical Memorials; with the title of the “Brief Narrative”—Author’s apology—Reasons for his plan being synoptical—His limitations—Method of exhibiting the “Brief Narrative” with the “Answer”—Title of Welde’s Answer—His announcements concerning this production—He reduces Rathband’s method to three particulars, and characterizes them—Their grounds, also three—And the printed authorities, perverted—The private Letters, incompetent proofs—Remark, introductory—Chap. i. Of Platform and Discipline—Chap. ii. Of the true Visible Church, in general—Chap. iii. Of the Matter of it—Chap. iv. Of its Form—Chap. v. Of the first erecting a Visible Church.

CHAP. LII.

RATHBAND AND WELDE, CONTINUED.

Page 315.—Chap. vi. Of Church Power—Chap. vii. Of Membership—Chap. viii. Of Dismission—Chap. ix. Of Communion, in general—Chap. x. Of Communion of Churches—Chap. xi. Of Excommunication, and Re-acceptance—Chap. xii. Of Officers—Chap. xiii. Of Prophets—Chap. xiv. Of Independency; and of Combination into Classes, etc.—Chap. xv. Of the Magistrate.—Rathband’s Postscript—Welde’s Postscript.

CHAP. LIII.

REPLY TO A. S.

Page 341.—Full Title of this reply to A. S.—Why Anonymous—Commotion created by the “Apology”—Cranford—Ridiculous Epithets—New England Elders disallow Presbytery—Folly of Peremptoriness—A. S. and W. R. confronted—Parliament resolve concerning the Apologetical Narration—The Scots’ Commissioners and A. S.—Opposition endured by the Apologists—Arrogance of A. S., how met—The Five, applauded—Modes of Discipline contrasted—Effects of forcing Conscience—M. S., his idea concerning Toleration—John Goodwin’s portion of this Reply; his preface—Of Presbyterian malevolence—Four Signs, indicative of religious peace—False position of the

Magistrate, under Presbytery—Dilemma, concerning the Magistrate—Of the change for the worse which Christianity makes in the Magistrate's authority, according to Presbyterians—But A. S. is wary—Why some, for their religion, submit to Authority—A. S., remark on his conceit—Original of Presbytery, whence? General remarks—Presbytery has a mixt Original, according to A. S.—His partiality reprov'd—Presbyterians' differences more considerable than the Independents'—Indecision of Presbyterians—Their government wants Christ's formal patent—Why it needs such a patent—What is imagined—But not substantiated, to convince opposites—It is not found in the Jewish practice—Of determining matters of Doctrine—The residence of that Power—Of things indifferent—The High Priest, more an Emblem Prelatical than Presbyterial—Neither is their Patent found in the New Testament—Analogical proofs, demanded—None, in Acts xv.—Nor is their Patent, in the Law of Nature—Display of Logical implements—A. S.'s failure complete—His exceptions against Independency, entered upon—Plan of procedure—A concession laid hold of—Three positions defensory—Objection, favouring Combination, remarked on—Subjection to Strangers, a curse—Analogy from Corporations—And from Reason, in various ways—A. S.'s sixteen objections, remarked on—Defectiveness alledged against Congregational government; God's remedy for—Why the lesser of two inconveniencies, preferable—That on the Presbyterian side, more irremediable—Help, from the Civil State, inefficacious—Combined Eldership, party and judge—Wherein the glory of Churches consists—Queries on Toleration—Remark on behalf of the Apologists—A. S. and his Twenty-one Reasons—Discontent, on the plea of want of Unity in Practice—Change from one bondage to another, after ease, a source of Discontent—Schisms apprehended among Presbyterians—Opinions, difficulty regarding their being imposed—Union required impertinently—Proffered leniency, not safe—Assumption regarding communicating at the Lord's Table—An Enthymeme—Miscarriage in New England, no bar to freedom of Conscience—Why Toleration desired of the Civil State—Due measure to be observed in punishments—Disorders retorted upon the Presbyterians—A. S.'s discomfiture.

CHAP. LIV.

EDWARDS'S ANTAPOLOGIA.

Page 366.—Title of the Heresy-hunter's present piece—Cranford's Imprimatur—Sets himself up as the Undeceiver—Disconcerted—His inauspicious position—Criminates the Apologists—Practices Cajolery—Exposed—His boastful resolution—Calumniates—Collection of Imputations—The Apologists' time of publication marvelled at—And, that they appealed to the Parliament—Challenged upon their Consciences—Sinister ends imputed—Dilemma proposed on Surmises—Of their holding Communion—Of privileges enjoyed in Holland—Adherence to Apostolic precedent, charged as "foolish"—Lax Opinions: countervailed—Of human prudence—Popular sympathy, how wrought—Secret of Edwards's ground of lament—Of the term "Independency"—Episcopalians and Independents equally adverse to the Presbyterians—Practices of Anti-presbyterian Preachers—Of Printing—Rapid growth of Independency; whence?—Sagacious assiduity of the Five—Simpson and T. Goodwin—Nye—Consultations queried—Contrary motives, imputed—Coaxing—Extenuation attempted—Personal vituperation—What the Apogetical Narration would prove—Its doom augured—Of a great Adventure—A great political movement, remarked upon—The extraordinary weight of the Five—Lament—Effectual way to mar Presbyterial Policy—Whence, Toleration, styled "the Devil's Masterpiece"—A Palinode implored of the Five.

CHAP. LV.

PRYNNE AND BURTON, OPPONENTS.

Page 385.—Marvellous notoriety of the Apologetical Party; and full title of Prynne's Twelve Questions—Title of Burton's Answer—His motives explained—Obstructions of a right Reformation—He expostulates—Impeaches—Scripture, his Arbiter—Prynne's First Question; for Human Prudence—

Resolved into Human Policy—A Challenge diverted—Gospel-government, not alterable—The Second question; for a National Church—Answered, by the practice of the Apostles—Laws to be reduced to the rule of Scripture—National Councils, unsafe for Spiritual ends—Consonancy to Scripture, strictly obligatory—Texts, misapplied—The Third and fourth Questions; for sufficiency: *ergo* Presbytery—Each true Church has the primitive Presbytery within itself—Instances, in Churches succeeding the Apostolic—Appeals, safer in a free Communion of Churches—The Fifth Question; for Supremacy, or Undisturbed Possession—Endangered, only in proportion to Antipathy to Christ's Kingdom—The Sixth Question; a *Petitio Principii*—Confutation—The Seventh Question; for Satisfaction of Conscience!—Pertinent Illustration—The Eighth Question; for Proof of Subordination in all National Churches—Instances, none suitable—The Ninth Question; for a special Liberty—Commission and precedent, demanded—The Tenth Question; for "Solid Reason"—Six, adduced—The Eleventh Question; a compound of Invectives—Reprisals—The Twelfth Question; into which, the Residue is cast—Answered, in order—"Uncharitableness," refuted.—Full Title of Prynne's "Independency Examined"—Burton's Introduction to his Strictures—Of the Preface—Prynne's First Interrogatory: Principles and Conclusions of Scriptural Independency—Christ's Kingship; by whom limited—Second Interrogatory: of Civil magistrates—Third Interrogatory: of Gathering Churches—Minor Interrogatories—Fourth Interrogatory: of the People's Power in Uniting into a Church—Fifth Interrogatory: of a Comparison between Presbyterian and Independent Churches—Sixth Interrogatory: superfluous—Seventh: of Dismissions—Eighth: of Baptism of Non-members' Infants—Ninth: of Rejecting from the Lord's Supper—Tenth: of Censures—Eleventh: of the Apostles, sitting as Elders—The Twelfth: of Coercive Power.—Prynne's "Third Book;" and Burton's self-defence.

CHAP. LVI.

APOLLONIJ.—BAILLIE.

Page 417.—The Walcheren Classis write to the Assembly of Divines—Dedication, by Apollonij—Epistle to the Assembly, signed by the President and others—Topics of their "Consideration"—i. Qualifications of Members—ii. Of a Church-Covenant—iii. Of a Visible Church—iv. Of the Keys—v. and vi. Concessions regarding the Ministry and Eldership—vii. Set Forms of Prayer.—Baillie—Finesse practised on the Reception of the Walcheren Letter—On the Ability of the Five, etc.—How Overborne—Represented to be discouraged—A Committee of Twelve, appointed by the Assembly—Manchester purges the University of Cambridge—Independents' way of Celebrating the Lord's Supper.—Hard condition of the Presbyterians—Not hopeless—Perplexities—John Dury—Obstructions—Thralldom of French Reformed Divines—English Anti-presbyterians called a "wild people"—Perplexities, again—Still more—Scotch intrigues—Religious Liberty suspended on Scotch military success—Jortin and others' case in New England—Contrary practice represented, at Home, and in Holland—A Fast, how observed—Power of the Independents—The Directory, commenced—Roger Williams—Independents make progress—Observances at the Lord's Supper—Assembly, why deserted—Struggle regarding Ordination—Of Communicating at a Table—Again—Compromise, after a three-weeks' debate—Battle at Marston-moor—Valour of the Independents—Edwards's Lecture, set up—Thomas Goodwin, represented to have been confounded—The House of Commons, and the Assembly's paper on Ordination—Suppression of Sectaries—The House of Commons grant an Order concerning Toleration of the Independents.

CHAP. LVII.

GRAND COMMITTEE OF ACCOMMODATION.—BAILLIE.

Page 447.—Measures ordered, to procure Union, or if impossible, then to seek a Toleration—Sub-Committee's Paper of Propositions, remarked on in eleven paragraphs.—Baillie relates the perseverance of the Independents on the subject of Religious Freedom—Cromwell's advancement necessary, to coun-

terbalance the Presbyterians—Sir Henry Vane—Proceedings of the Independents, in the Army, in the House of Commons, and in the Grand Committee: Foreign Divines, of various judgments—Grand Committee dissolved—The Directory, sent up to the Houses—Particulars relating to it—Manchester and Cromwell criminate each other—Funeral Sermons—Medley of designs imputed to the Independents—Self-denying Ordinance—Progress, in the Assembly matters, since the taking of Newcastle—The Episcopal Party—Baillie remonstrates with Buchanan—Wheedles him—Baillie at Edinburgh.

CHAP. LVIII.

THE REASONS OF THE INDEPENDENTS ; OR, THE GRAND DEBATE.

Page 460.—Certain Papers of the Assembly of Divines, published with one Title afterward cancelled, and another substituted—Of those of the Independents—The noted “Third Proposition” of the Presbyterians—“Reasons, against” it, under their several divisions.

CHAP. LIX.

THE REASONS ; OR, THE GRAND DEBATE ; CONTINUED.

Page 489.—Continuation of the former Chapter, with the Signatures of the Five and two more.

CHAP. LX.

LAUD'S EXECUTION.—BURTON'S “GRAND IMPOSTOR.”

Page 513.—Dr. S. Johnson's opinion of Laud—Extreme opinions, concerning him—Of the Fathers, Laud and Heylyn—The mode of Laud's execution changed—Burton publishes on the event—He deprecates “malice,” but displays revenge—Exordium of Laud's Dying Speech—Comment on a phrase in it—How the Pillory was transformed into a Scaffold—Remarks upon Laud's text—Of despising Shame—Metonymy of “the Red Sea”—A covert allusion to the Parliament—The fiery Furnace—Mercy in store—God alone judgeth hearts; men judge actions—John Baptist—Paul and Stephen—Popery, the Grandam of divisions—The King—Of the City's Petition, for justice upon Laud—Church of England's distraction—Laud's Protestantism—He asks Forgiveness—Some of his oppressive measures, instanced—His precogitated Prayer, analyzed in eight paragraphs—Of his derogations of the self-sufficiency of the Scriptures—Passages out of Burton's Reply to Laud's Relation—Laud's impenitency—Comments on his death; by Anthony à Wood and Robert Southey—Dr. Short, on estimating Laud's character—Title of a Sermon on his death, by J. H.—Extract, in the construction of which the rhetorical figure Synathrœsmus is used—Imparity between Christ and Laud—Why Laud missed his aim—Remark, introductory to the “Prayer”—The Prayer—Extolled by Dr. Southey—Remark upon Bishop Hacket—His account of Laud's enmity—Vandyke's fidelity.

CHAP. LXI.

TRACT, BY D. P. P.—ANOTHER, BY W. L.; OF GREAT HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE.—
A THIRD, BY JOHN PRICE.—BAILLIE.

Page 535.—Full title of the “Antidote,” against Independency—This Puritan's general sources of sorrow—His particular sources, stated under six divisions—He Proffers advice—But gives it, under a Jesuit's hood with six folds.—Remark on the Independents' military reputation—Title of a Tract by W. L., on Independents being admitted into the Army—Occasion of it—Sixteen reasons adduced, to evince the propriety of the Proposition—Objections and replies.—“Independency Accused, and Acquitted.”—Of the anonymous Plaintiff; and the Defendent, J. P.—The former's Plea—His first Argument: negative—Its Invalidity—Illustration, by several instances—Antiquity, its remains defective—Justificatory Inferences—Another Argument: practice in New England—The cases there, exaggerated here—Remonstrance, sent over—Evil surmisings, censured.—Baillie, in Edinburgh—His return to London, at a critical juncture—Undervalues the New-modelled Army—Progress in the Assembly; and designs of the Scottish Army—Developed,

further—Selden's vanity—Imputation of Republicanism, against the Independents—Queries to Cranford—He and Baillie in trouble—Labyrinth of a Catalogue of Sins: the Naseby fight; showing how greatly Baillie had undervalued the New-modelled Army—Apprehension, in consequence—Perplexities—Call for increase of the Scots' Forces—Independents expelled their pulpits—Their stated ministers, and lecturers, in London—The Independents alleged to change their policy—Tyrannical designs of the Court—Erastianism of the House of Commons—Presbyterians prepare Papers on Scandals—Vossius—Chiliasts, or Millenaries, in the Assembly—The House of Commons, swayed by the Erastians, promulgate Ordinances for erecting a mild system of Presbyterianism—They pass votes, which displease the Scots Commissioners—Amyraut—Committee for Accommodation revived—The Independents demand Toleration—They print their "Remonstrance"—And persist in their demand—The Presbyterians gather strength—The Militia—Advance of the Scots' Army—Presbyterian Ministers' studies proposed to be searched.

CHAP. LXII.

COTTON'S "WAY OF THE CHURCHES."—"ANIMADVERSIONS" UPON COTTON'S
"KEYS" AND "WAY."—HIS DEFENCE.

Page 560.—Title of Cotton's treatise, "The Way of the Churches," etc.—Obstacles against Printing—Editors' explanations—The seven topics of the treatise—Ruling Elders—Imposition of hands, by Laymen—Of Elders preaching—Traces of apostolical institution of Ruling Elders—Deacons—Widows—All, how chosen—The Pastor—The Deacons—Seven, may constitute a Church—Admission of Members—Fit materials of a Church—Administration of the Ordinances: Public Worship—Sacraments—Afternoon Service—Occasional Services—Church Censures—Re-acceptance—With one accord—Explanation—Constituent elements of Church-government—Communion of Saints—The foregoing, a just account of proceedings in New England—Grounds favourable to a Gospel-Reformation in England—Fifteen Propositions—Remark upon them.—Title of a tract, "Vindiciæ Clavium," etc.—General remarks—Cotton's notice of that tract—He explains—And answers, in three sections—Cautionary remark.

THE PRINCIPAL NOTES.

	PAGE
Richard Hooker's dread of Reform	33
The Zealous Puritan : a Ballad	41
W. Lilly, on obtruding the Book of Common Prayer.....	42
Lilburne's "Work of the Beast;" with interesting particulars concerning Himself	<i>ib.</i>
Indisputable testimony of Laud being early popishly affected	45
Selden on Oaths	85
Lord Brooke's death, and Laud's notice of it	130
Laud's Parentage	133
Animosity between Lawyers and Bishops.....	154
Brownist Commotion	163
Baptism, a qualification for Membership	166
Rutherford's Mid-line of Presbytery	177
Who began the War?	189
Resistance; whether Prayers and Tears amount to it?	195
Assembly of Divines; description of them and their proceedings	217
The Visionary John Dury	387
Church and State, separated in the Netherlands	395
R. Baxter's and P. Henry's testimonies concerning Independents.....	406
Professor Moulin, adverse to Independency	435
The Synod at Charenton's Decree against Independency	459
Baillie's "Assembly Speech," relating the Downfall of Episcopacy	<i>ib.</i>
Laud and America	514
Laud abandoned by the Peers	523
Le Bas and the Et-cætera Oath.....	526
Laud's Quailing Letter to Selden	527
Bishop Short on Dr. Southey's "Book of the Church"	530

ERRATA.

- P. 44, l. 42, for "Forsakes," read "Forsakers."
 68, l. 10, *dele* "Anonymous."
 379, note d, for p. 217, read 377.
 433, l. 3, for "guide," read "denial."
 439, l. 14, for "our," read "an."
 446, l. 9, for "members," read "churches."
 527, l. 8, note, and l. 30, for "Seldon," read "Selden."

HISTORICAL MEMORIALS.

CHAP. XXXIV.

HEYLYN'S ANSWER TO BURTON.—MILTON'S PROPHECY.

It was Burton's lot to be loaded by the interested and the prejudiced with every species of indignity, "the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps."^a Laud's "subservient instrument," ever ready "to do the dirty work," and "never to be relied upon where he can gloss over any matter in favour of his patron, or against the Puritans,"^b was set on to stigmatize, cum privilegio, in the shape of "A Brief and Moderate Answer to the Seditious and Scandalous Challenges of Henry Burton, late of Friday-street; in the Two Sermons by him preached on the Fifth of November, 1636; and, in the 'Apology' prefixt before them. By Peter Heylyn. 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14. Lond. 1637." 4to. pp. 194.

"Prefixt before" the rest of this load of learned lumber stands a "lordly" imprimatur, "summa approbationis," from "Lambeth House," which Milton describes as "so apishly Romanizing, that the word of command was still set down in Latin."^c The Preface opens with the

^a Deut. xxxii. 33.

^b "The Christian Observer: Conducted by Members of the Established Church," June, 1837, p. 403.

^c Areopagitica. Works, edit. 1833, imp. 8vo. p. 106.—"A resolution had been taken, by command of his Majesty [!] to proceed against the Triumvirate of Libellers, as one fitly calls them, to a public censure, which was like to make much noise amongst the ignorant people. It was thought fit, by the prudent council of Queen Elizabeth, upon the execution of some Priests and Jesuits, that an Apology should be published by the name of 'Justitia Britannica,' to vindicate the public justice of the state from such aspersions as, by the tongues and pens of malicious persons, should be laid upon it. And, on the like prudential grounds, it was thought expedient that an Answer should be made to the book which seemed most material; and, being so made, should be kept in readiness

customary practice of imputing positive faults, in those who are, or ought to be, under subjection: these “are not afraid to speak evil of dignities;” they “speak evil of the things they understand not!”^a Thus the Heylyns of every age would prejudice their readers, and minion-like, admit of none but passive faults in those whose instruments they are; and so “make the king glad with their wickedness, and the princes with their lies.”^b Hence the first four pages, and more, of this “Moderate” Answerer’s Preface are occupied “to no profit, but to the subverting”^c of those who may choose to be led away by them; the first morsel of honest information arrived at being imbedded so far in, and that mingled with characteristic ingredients. “No times,” he says, “more full of *odious* pamphlets; no pamphlets more applauded, *nor* more dearly bought, than such as do most deeply wound those powers and dignities to which *the Lord* hath made us subject.” That is truly, “pamphlets” were never so multiplied as then; such “pamphlets” were never sought after so eagerly; and none ever answered their purposes so well! Wherefore? What made the then “powers and dignities” so successfully assailable by those paper-pellets? Surely “those factious spirits, Leighton, and Prynne, and Bastwick, the *triumviri*, with H. Burton, the *dictator*,” could not by noise and clamours” alone, have “fastened odious scandals,”—and what “scandals” are not “odious?”—“on their reverend mother!” It is not for us to answer, “What jealousies and fears, that I may say no worse, have they seditiously infused into people’s minds, and thereby turned those weapons on their mother’s children, which might have been employed more fitly on the common enemy?” It were bad enough to have barely infused “jealousies and fears;” but to do it “seditiously,” must greatly aggravate the evil: however, this enormity “might have been employed” somewhat “fitly” against Papists! They were not then, “those powers and dignities to which *the Lord* hath made us subject!” We now say with Heylyn, for once, “egregium vero laudem, et spolia ampla!”

“*Dictator* Burton, ἀνὴρ τὸ φρόνημα ἐνθέρμος a man in whom the element of fire had the most predominancy; which made that which is zeal in others to be, in him, a zealous fury; the rather, since he had deceived himself in his expectations, and swallowed down[!] those hopes he could not digest!” Such is the horrible monster Heylyn’s magic sets before us. We shall not stop to remark on his parallelism between Burton and Ærius; nor to consider how it is, that because a man entertains a “dislike” of the, so styled, “holy hierarchy,” he must of necessity be a “heretic;” neither shall we stay to inquire why “his majesty’s old and faithful servant” might not feel grieved that he had been supplanted in his just and honourable expectations by crafty

till the execution of the sentence; to the end that the people might be satisfied as well in the greatness of the crimes as the necessity and justice of the punishment inflicted upon one of the principals, by whom a judgment might be made of all the rest. But the censure being deferred from Easter until Midsummer Term, the Answer lay dormant all the while at Lambeth, in the hands of the licenser.”—Heylyn’s *Life of Laud*; an. 1637. p. 332.

^a 2 Pet. ii. 10, 12,

^b Hos. vii. 3.

^c Tim. ii. 14.

and evil designing courtiers ; neither, again, shall we dwell on a refutation of the charge that Burton's "unlicensed 'Babel'" was "guilty of sedition, and tended to incense the Commons against the King." Burton did, indeed, "nonplus" the "great prelate" who originated the charge which Heylyn does but echo : "No, my lord," said he, "I dedicated my book to the whole Parliament ; to wit, to the King and both the Houses. I do not divide the head from the body, my Lord, but I pray God unite them."^a "Mute," as Burton tells us Laud was "hereat," that "Goliath" planted "the foil," in Heylyn's phraseology here ; but it was rebutted for that time by the judges granting the "prohibition,"^b on the pleading of "Prynne" forsooth, who thereby showed, according to Heylyn, his "strong desire to fill up the measure of his iniquities."

Nowhere else is the immense importance of Burton's labours, influence, and success, so fully set forth as in this "Moderate" Answerer's Preface. He even resorts to a comparison of Burton with "Faux" and "Catesby," and yields the superiority of Burton's "pestilent pamphlets" over their "powder !" thus showing how admirably the alleged "holy hierarchy" had tutored the minds of the public, to induce them to "swallow down" what Burton chose "to disgorge !" At last he was "caught" fast hold of by a pursuivant armed with "letters missive ;" and now it became an audacity that he should "appeal" to his Majesty's clemency and justice !

"That faction, in the church," says Heylyn, "which Master Burton and his copesmates have so much laboured to promote, hath, since the *first beginning* of it, accused the Church of England of the self-same crimes whereof they now pronounce her guilty ; nor have they found any new matter wherewithal to charge her, than that which their forefathers had been hammering on in the times before them : yet they cry out with no less violence, but far more malice, than their fathers did, and fill the minds of jealous and distrustful people with doubts and fears of innovations of and in the worship of God, and the whole doctrine of religion ; as if the banks were broken down and Popery were breaking in amain upon us, only because they can no longer be permitted to violate all the orders of *God's church* here by law established." God's church, established by human law ! So says Heylyn, who also tells us, "That the world might see, and see how scandalously and seditiously they traduce the church, I was *commanded by authority* to return an Answer to all the challenges and charges in the said Two Sermons and Apology of Master Burton. For being it was the leading libel in respect of time,—the principal matters in the "News from Ipswich,"^c being borrowed from Master Burton's Sermon,—and that those many which have followed are but a repetition of and a dilating on

^a Burton's "For God and the King," p. 45.

^b *Ibid.* p. 53.

^c "News from Ipswich : Discovering certain late detestable Practices of some domineering Lordly Prelates, to undermine the established Doctrine and Discipline of our Church ; extirpate all sincere Preachers and Preaching of God's Word ; usher in Popery, Superstition, and Idolatry.—Jere. xxiii. 1.—" 4to. pp. 7. Subscribed, "From Ipswich, Nov. 12, 1636. Thine in the Lord, Matthew White."

those points which are there contained ; it was conceived that he being answered, the rest would perish of themselves. On this *command*, I set myself unto the work. . . . Beginning first with the ‘Apology,’ so far forth as it justifieth his said ‘Appeal.’”

Heylyn’s first chapter opens with gibes, and to what reasoning he was about to employ he added the superciliousness of some demi-officials. “I would fain know what moved you to ‘Appeal’ unto his Majesty, at your first conventing ? . . . We must needs conceive there was some special reason in it, which might induce you to cry out before you were hurt ; more than the matter of the ‘Articles’ which were read unto you, or your own guilty conscience, which had pre-condemned you. Yes sure ; for you except against as well the ‘incompetency’ of the ‘judges,’ as the ‘illegal manner of proceedings in the high commission.’ The ‘judges’ you except against,—excepting ‘those honourable nobles, judges, counsellors of state,’ which are seldom there,—as ‘parties in the cause,’ and ‘adversaries’ to your person, ‘for the cause’ sake.”^a . . . Suppose them ‘parties,’ and what then ? Then, by the ‘laws of God and Nature,’ as also by ‘the common, canon and civil laws,’^b they are prohibited from being judges ! This is the first crutch [crotchet] your ‘Appeal’ halts with, and this will fail you. For, howsoever it be true, in ordinary course, that no man can be ‘judge in his own cause’ there, where the cause concerns himself in his own particular, yet it is otherwise in a body aggregate, or a public person. Suppose . . . that a man within the Liberties of London, should say ‘A fig for my Lord Mayor !’ might not my Lord Mayor clap him in the Compter ?^c And yet the Parliament, and the judges, and the justices, and the Lord Mayor of London, are as much ‘parties’ in these cases, as the archbishop, bishops, chancellors, and the rest of the high commission are, by you, said, and only said, to be in the other ! For that they are not ‘parties,’ we shall see anon. . . .

“That which you next attempt, is to prove them ‘adversaries ;’ . . . adversaries of your ‘person, for the cause’ sake :’ say then, the adversaries of the ‘cause ;’ let your ‘person’ go, as a contemptible thing that provokes no ‘adversary !’ Yet we will take you with us, to avoid exceptions, and see what proof you have to make them ‘adversaries’ to your ‘person, for the cause’ sake.’ And first, they are your ‘adversaries,’ because the ‘adversaries of those truths’ by you delivered in your sermon.”^d . . . When you leave to speak the truth, . . . and fall upon seditious, false, and factious discourses, to inflame the people, and bring them into ill opinion both of their king and those to whom the government of the church is, by him, intrusted, you are no more a preacher, but a prevaricator ; a dangerous *boutefeu* and incendiary, as you have been hitherto. That this is true, shall be most plainly manifested in the Anatomy of your Sermon—for we will call it so to please you. . .

^a Apol. p. 6.

^b Heylyn has transposed “canon and civil,” contrary to Burton’s order ; an incident, small as it appears, not without significancy.

^c A prison in Wood-street, afterward in the Poultry, the site of which is now occupied by a Congregational Church.

^d Apol. p. 7.

A second reason which you have to prove them your 'adversaries,' is, that they have usurped such a 'title' of jurisdiction, 'as cannot consist with that title of jurisdiction, which the law of the land hath annexed to the crown imperial.' If so, they are the king's adversaries, in the first place; robbing him of the fairest flower in the regal diadem! . . . But, how may it appear unto us? . . . 'Because,' say you, they 'do continually exercise their Episcopal jurisdiction, without any 'Letters Patent' of his Majesty, or his progenitors; 'in their own names and rights [only,' not in his Majesty's name and right.^a . . . This being objected to them in that sermon also, we shall there meet with it. One thing I must take with me now, for fear I find it not hereafter. You say, the bishops exercise the Episcopal jurisdiction 'in their own names and rights only;' not in his Majesty's name and right, 'to the manifest breach of their oaths. . . . The statute 1 Eliz. c. i. uniting all manner of jurisdiction Ecclesiastical whatsoever unto the imperial crown of this realm, enacteth the oath of supremacy and allegiance *eo nomine*, to that very end and purpose, that none should presume to exercise any Ecclesiastical jurisdiction within this realm, but by virtue of the King's Letters Patent, and in the King's Majesty's name and right.' . . . Pray you Sir! was the 'Oath of Allegiance' enacted 1st of Elizabeth. . . . It is reported to have been enacted, 3 Jacobi, on the occasion of the Gunpowder Treason. And for the 'Oath of Supremacy,' made, indeed, 1 Eliz., was it enacted *eo nomine*, to that 'end and purpose,' as you please to tell us?^b What? that no bishop might proceed in exercise of his ordinary Episcopal authority, without especial Letters Patent, and in the Queen's Majesty's name and right only? . . . Assuredly, learned Sir! that oath was framed to settle the abolishment of all foreign power and jurisdiction; such as the Popes of Rome had lately practised in this kingdom, and for no other end and purpose. . . . I see, Sir, you are as excellent in the law as in the gospel!"^c

The next paragraph is so contrived as to mislead any one who should desire to gather Burton's real argument. "Let's on, Sir," says Heylyn, "to those other Arguments which you have studied, to prove the high commissioners to be your 'adversaries.'" Here he collects the premises out of three of Burton's paragraphs, and makes them play "handy-dandy;" jumbling the relevant and the irrelevant; and at last, he contrives to let slip the conclusion which he undertook to prove; the converse of Burton's, that those from whom he appealed were his "adversaries," and "so incompetent judges" of him and of his cause.

^a Apol. p. 8.

^b Heylyn has blundered. Burton was, it is true, incorrect in coupling with 'Oath' in the singular, the phrase 'of Supremacy and Allegiance,' when he intended only the Oath 1st Eliz., as the context shows; for where charging the Bishops with the breach 'of their oaths,' he means that 'these men,' those against whom he excepts, p. 8, had taken each the oath alluded to; and so in referring to them used the phrase 'their oaths.' That this is a just explanation, is confirmed where, seven lines beneath, he employs the phrase "this very *Act*, which they thus notoriously transgress, is the ground whereupon their Commission in Causes Ecclesiastical is erected; and that, principally, for the better observation of the said *Act*, &c."

^c See back, vol. i. p. 504.

Where he says, "so far we have gone after you, or with you, rather," it had been more correct to have said, "or beside you!"

"We must next *look upon* you whilst you plead your cause, as it reflects upon the 'illegality' of the judge's proceedings." Heylyn is willing to stop and gaze awhile here, as well he might, at Burton's "division," into "two parts: the one, general, which concerns 'their usual practice' in all other cases; the other, particular, in your own case:" yet he admonishes Burton for this; "It had been fitter sure, you had left out the general, and fallen on the particular only; for in such things which are, you say, their 'usual practice,' what cause have *you* to make 'appeal,' more than other men?" Some would have thought it had been still "fitter" to have left out the "particular" also; since most "other men" were terrified into silence, and why should not Burton? But "people's heads" being set a buzzing that the proceedings of the High Commission Court "are contrary to piety, to law, to charity, and utterly against the liberty of the King's good subjects, . . . we must do what we can, to rase it out again!" This, then, is part of Heylyn's undertaking: now for the execution or accomplishment of it.

"Your first exception is against the oath 'ex officio.'" Heylyn's defence of this oath, borrowed chiefly from Dr. Cosin, as he acknowledges, we are relieved, happily, from introducing. We insert only this passage. "In such cases [causes] as principally do concern the high commission, it hath not been thought fit to admit counsel for drawing up an answer unto the Articles objected; the better to avoid delays, and that foul palliating of schisms and errors which might thence arise." We are indebted to Heylyn for letting out the secret from its prison-house. But it is our happiness to be able to show beyond cavil, that the men who, like Burton, and "some that had" what Heylyn calls "as evil will to the church as he, in Queen Elizabeth's time," have proved themselves to be some of Britain's best champions for constitutional liberty; which the celebrated exponent of "The Laws of England" thus certifies: "The canonical doctrine of purgation, whereby the parties were obliged to answer upon oath to any matter, however criminal, that might be objected against them,—though long ago overruled in the Court of Chancery, the genius of English law having broken through the bondage imposed on it by its clerical chancellors, and asserted the doctrines of judicial as well as civil liberty,—continued till the middle of the last century to be upheld by the Spiritual Courts; when the Legislative was obliged to interpose to teach them a lesson of similar moderation."^a This historical testimonial releases us also from noticing correlate "exceptions" slurred over

^a Mr. Justice Blackstone's Commentaries, bk. iii. ch. vii.—"When the High Commission Court was abolished by Statute 16 Car. I. c. ii. this 'Oath ex-officio' was abolished with it," chap. xxvii.—"By the Statute of 13 Car. II. c. 12, it is enacted, That it shall not be lawful for any Bishop, or Ecclesiastical Judge, to tender or administer to any person whatsoever, the Oath usually called 'the oath ex-officio,' or any other Oath whereby he may be compelled to confess, accuse, or purge himself of any criminal matter or thing, whereby he may be liable to any censure or punishment." Chap. vii.

or quibbled at by Heylyn; who finishes this his first chapter, occupied chiefly upon Burton's Apology, "wherein is nothing to be found but poor surmises;" and yet, notwithstanding this unprofitable labour, Heylyn tells Burton, "I am resolved to dissect you thoroughly, and lay you open to the world, which hath so long been seduced by you!" How the vaunting anatomist succeeded will be shown.

Hitherto it should seem that Heylyn has been wasting his labour, for continuing to follow his calling, as in duty bound, he commences his Second Chapter, with a sentence of *depravation*; "declining" from "an 'Apology' that was *full of weakness*, unto a 'Sermon' or rather a Pasquil, far more full of wickedness!" After exhibiting various coruscations of a heated imagination, and having warned Burton of that "calamity" which "is now like to fall" upon him, "Now," exclaims Heylyn, "for the *method* of your 'Sermon'—I mean to call it so no more,—though you observe no method in it!" The passages "therein, either of scandal or sedition, I shall reduce," so he goes on, "especially unto these two heads; those which reflect upon the King's most excellent Majesty; and, those which strike directly against the bishops."

"First, for the King; you may remember what I told you^a was the Puritan tenet,—That kings are but the ministers of the commonwealth; and, that they have no more authority than what is given them by the people. This, though you do not say expressly and *in terminis*, yet you come very near to it—to a tantamount—finding great fault with that *unlimited power* which some give to kings; and also, with that *absolute obedience* which is exacted of the subject. . . Finally, you reckon it amongst the 'Innovations' wherewith you charge the prelates, in point of doctrine, That they have laboured to make a change in the doctrine of Obedience to Superiors; setting man so in God's throne, that all obedience to man must be absolute, without regard to God, and conscience, whose only rule is the word of God."^b

"Now, Sir, I pray you, what are you; or by what spirit are you guided; that you should find yourself aggrieved at 'unlimited power,' which some of better understanding than yourself, have given to kings; or [that you should] think it any 'innovation' in point of doctrine, in case the doctrine of Obedience to our Superiors be pressed more home of late than it hath been formerly?"^c

"Your 'reprehension,' is 'of those that so advance man's ordinances and commandments, as though they be contrary to God's law and the fundamental laws of the state, yet press men to obedience to them;'^d your instance, is of one which was shrewdly threatened . . . 'for refusing to do that which was not agreeable' to the Word of God;^e namely, for refusing 'to read the Book for Sports.' . . . So then, the case is this, The king permits his people honest recreations on the Lord's day, according as had been accustomed, till you and your accomplices had cried it down; with order to the bishops, to see his 'Declaration *published* in the churches of their several dioceses respectively.' This

^a P. 10.^b P. 26, 27.^c P. 28.^d Serm. p. 77.^e *Ibid.* in marg.

publication you conceive to be repugnant to God's word,—though none but a few factious spirits so conceived it, and, that your doctrine of the Sabbath, be contrary to all antiquity, and modern churches;—and, therefore, by your rule they do very well that refuse to publish it. It is true indeed, in things that are directly contrary to the Law of God, and such as carry in them a plain and manifest impiety, there is no question to be made but it is better 'to obey God' than man:^a but, when the matter chiefly resteth either in misapplying, or misunderstanding the Word of God,—a fault too incident to ignorant and unstable men; and to none more than to your disciples, and their teachers too!—or that the Word of God be made a *property*, like the Pharisees' corban,^b to justify your disobedience unto kings and princes; your rule is then as false as your action [is] faulty."^c

"Since you are so much grieved at the 'unlimited power'—as you please to call it—which some give to kings, will you be pleased to know that kings do hold their crowns by no other tenure than *Dei gratia*; and that whatever power they have, they have from God, by whom 'kings reign, and princes decree justice.'"^d

"But you go further yet, and tell us of some things the King cannot do; and, that there is a power which the King hath not. What is it, say you, that the King cannot do? Marry! you say he cannot institute new rites and ceremonies with the advice of his Commissioners Ecclesiastical, or the Metropolitan, according as some 'plead' from the Act of Parliament before the Communion Book! Why so?"^e Ah, say we too, Why so? And now let the reader see wherein lies not accordance but *discordance* between Heylyn's statement and Burton's. Having shown "wherein the Prelates" endanger a division between the King and his subjects, Burton asks, "But upon what ground is all this? What authority do they show for these outrages? The King? That is answered before, by his solemn protestations to the contrary. But they *plead* the Act of Parliament for Uniformity, before the Communion Book, wherein is reserved a power to the Queen 'with advice of her Commissioners, or of the Metropolitan, to ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of his church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments.' Hereupon they ground all their Innovations. But, for this: first observe, that this clause of the Act is limited to Queen Elizabeth, and not extended to her successors of the crown; they are still expressed."^f A fairer specimen of priestcraft for shifting an odium from the shoulders of the "holy hierarchy" upon the King's, than that presented by Burton, cannot be expected to be produced. His charge is, that the Prelates have availed themselves of a defunct statutable authority, to cover their Innovations beneath the King's name; although, as he shows, the King cannot exercise any authority derivable from that statute; thus leaving the force of his argument against the Prelates augmented by a proof of the illegality of their doings.

^a Acts v. 29.

^d Prov. viii. 15.—P. 32.

^b Mark vii. 11.

^e P. 34.

^c P. 29, 30.

^f Serm. p. 65.

Heylyn labours again, in his Third Chapter, particularly to turn the brunt of Burton's arguments from the Bishops upon the King: arguing still that every thing done in the King's name, was rather the act and counsel of those about him and under him.^a For a dexterous way of evading a point, and a determination that the scandal of the Book of Sports shall lie upon King James, although it was drawn up by Bishop Morton,^b mark Heylyn's "sounding brass,"^c where he tells Burton, "You lay a scandal on the dead who are now laid to sleep in the bed of peace, and tell us of that Prince of blessed memory, King James, that the said Book for Sports 'was procured, compiled, and published in the time of his Progress into Scotland, when he was more than ordinarily merrily disposed.'^d When he was 'more than ordinarily merrily disposed!' Good Sir, your meaning. Dare you conceive a base and disloyal thought, and not speak it out; for all that 'παρρησία' which you so commend against kings and princes?^e Leave you so fair a face with so foul a scar; and make that peerless Prince, whom you and yours did blast with daily libels when he was alive, the object of your Puritanical, aye and *uncharitable* scoffs, now he is deceased? Unworthy wretch! whose greatest and most pure devotion had never so much heaven in it as his greatest mirth!" Sage and disinterested reproof, from the pen of a chaplain to two monarchs and to an archbishop to boot! We cannot but hasten to his next chapter, wherein we are promised "A plain discovery of H. B.'s quarrels against the Bishops, in reference to their Calling and their Persons."

Arrived at Heylyn's Fourth Chapter, it is our first care not to lose sight of the fact, that while attempting to vindicate the claim of Apostolic Succession through the Church of Rome, Heylyn is compelled to admit that a flaw is found, where, he says, "Irenæus brings down the succession till his own time;^f during which time the lineal succession in that church, by reason of many persecutions under which it suffered, might be made most questionable:" this he follows, by-the-bye, with the remark, "We may receive our Orders from them, and challenge a Succession by them, from the blessed Apostles; and yet not be partakers with them in their corruptions. . . If you have any other pedigree, as perhaps you have, from Wicliffe, Huss, the Albigenses, and the rest which you used to boast of, keep it to yourself." Heylyn preferred affinity to the line of the Gardiners and Bonners, whence might come his high reverence for his patron Archbishop, whom it was his business to screen even at the expense of his Sovereign: "For his Majesty's Declaration about Lawful Sports, you have no reason to charge that on my Lord Archbishop, as if it were a matter of his procuring; or, if it were, to reckon it amongst his faults. His sacred Majesty, treading in the steps of his royal father, thought fit to suffer his good subjects to enjoy that innocent freedom, which before they

^a The Seventeenth Article of Bishop Wren's Impeachment is that "Finding the people dislike his Innovations, he often publicly said, he introduced them 'by the King's command,' and thereby endeavoured to raise an ill opinion of his Majesty in the hearts of his subjects." Wren's Parentalia, 1750. fol. p. 14.

^b Neal, Hist. Purit. vol. ii. ch. 2.

^c 1 Cor. xiii. 1.

^d Serm. p. 58.

^e *Ibid.* p. 26, 27.

^f Lib. iii. cap. 3.

did; in using moderate and lawful recreations on the Sunday. . . A pious and a princely act, however you and such as you, traduce it every day in your scandalous pamphlets. . . All that my Lord Archbishop had to do therein, was to commit the publication of it to his suffragan bishops, according to his Majesty's just will and pleasure; and if that be the thing you except against, your quarrel is not at his act, but his obedience." Such is Laudean loyalty.

It cannot be thought undutiful of Heylyn that he should magnify both the Office and the Persons of the Bishops, against whom, he has made it indisputably clear that Burton preached and prayed for their extirpation. We seek not to cover Burton's excesses, nor to excuse or palliate his incivilities. The policy which the bishops practised was not calculated to conciliate, and their ruin "is a pregnant evidence"^a that however sycophants might applaud them as the wisest of men and the most watchful of shepherds, their government was tyrannical and their flock consequently rebellious.

As Heylyn's former chapter treated of "the Calling and the Persons" of the Bishops, so the Fifth has reference to "their place and calling," or, as the heading is, "Their Jurisdiction and Episcopal Government." For one particular herein, we are presumptuous enough to put Heylyn on his trial. Other particulars, here and elsewhere, deserve special notice, but that the limits of our undertaking compel our forbearance. The reader will bear in mind that Heylyn is now defending the Bishop of Norwich; but he looks back to Burton's instance of "the Ministers of Surrey,"^b and asks, "What want of remedy can you or they complain of, if they have not sought it; or rather, if their conscience tell them, and those with whom they had advised advertise them, that, in such cases as this, the judges cannot by the law award a prohibition, if they should desire it? Do you conceive the case aright? If not, I will take leave to tell you. His Majesty having published his Declaration about lawful pastimes on the Sunday, gives order to his Bishops that 'publication thereof be made in all their several dioceses respectively.' The Bishops hereupon appoint the Incumbent of every church to read the book unto the people, that so the people might the better take notice of it; and finding opposition to the said appointment, made by some refractory persons of your own condition, press them to the performance of it by virtue of that canonical obedience, which, by their several oaths, they were bound to yield unto their Ordinaries. But seeing nothing but contempt; and contempt upon contempt: after much patience and long suffering, and expectation of conformity to their said appointment, some of the most perverse amongst them have, in some places, been suspended, as well *a beneficio* as *officio*, for an example to the rest. No man deprived or 'outed' as you say, of his 'means' and livelihood ['freehold,' in Burton,] that I hear of yet! This is the case: which being merely Ecclesiastical as unto the ground, being a contempt of and against the Ordinary; and merely Ecclesiastical as unto the censure, which was suspension; I cannot see what remedy you can find for them amongst the lawyers,

^a Heylyn, p. 106.

^b See back, vol. i. p. 554.

but that which every man might give them, good and wholesome counsel. And call you this a persecution, when a few refractory persons are justly punished, in a legal way, for their disobedience? For howsoever they and you pretend, that the command was contrary to the Law of God, and could not be performed with a safe conscience, yet this was only a pretence; their reading of the book—had the contents thereof displeased them—being no more an argument of their approbation of anything therein contained than when a common crier reads a proclamation which perhaps he likes not. It must be, therefore, some *Association* had and made amongst them to stand it out unto the last, and put some baffle or affront on that authority which had imposed it!

“Such also is the persecution, doubtless, which you so complain of in the ‘two whole counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, where, in a very short space,’ as you say, ‘there hath been the foulest havoc of Ministers and their flocks, etc., as ever our eyes have seen; [Burton’s words are, ‘they have made the foulest havoc of good Ministers and the flocks;’] there being already,’ as you tell us, ‘sixty Ministers suspended, and between sixty and eighty more having had time given them till Christ-tide,’—take heed of Christ-mass, by all means!—‘by which time,’ as you say, ‘they must either bid their good conscience farewell, or else their precious ministry and necessary means. In all Queen Mary’s time no such havoc made, in so short a time, of the faithful Ministers of God in any part of, yea or in the whole land.’^a The same is also told us in the ‘News from Ipswich.’ Nay, more than so, you tell us how one or two godly ministers,—some of your associates,—were threatened by Dr. Corbet, Chancellor of that Diocese, with ‘pistolling’ and ‘hanging,’ and I know not what, because they had refused to read his Majesty’s Declaration about Lawful Sports.^b In this you do as shamefully belie the Chancellor as you have done the Bishop in all the rest; of whose proceedings in that Diocese I will present you with a short account, that you may see how grossly you abuse the world.

“And first, you may be pleased to know, that the Clergy of that Diocese, comprehending all that are in spiritual dignity or office, and all Parsons, Vicars, Curates, and Schoolmasters—taking in the Lecturers withal—amount unto the number of fifteen hundred, or thereabouts. So that in case there had been ‘sixty’ of that fifteen hundred ‘suspended’ by the Bishop, as you say there were, had this been such a terrible persecution as you give it out for? But yet it is not so, as you tell us, neither: for, at the beginning of November, when you preached that pasquil, of the fifteen hundred there were not twice fifteen, and that is not half your number, involved in any Ecclesiastical Censure of what sort soever, and not above sixteen ‘suspended.’ Sixty and sixteen are alike in sound, but very different in the number! And

^a Burton, p. 65.

^b Burton’s own words are, “Dr. Corbet, Chancellor to the Bishop of Norwich, —Mr. Greenhill, an eminent Minister, coming to him, with another Minister, in humble manner to desire absolution from excommunication, for the refusal of conformity to their new rites, said unto him, in a great heat of passion, That if he had the power as he desired, he would pistol him.”

of those sixteen, eight were then absolved for a time of further trial to be taken of them; and two did voluntarily resign their places; so that you have but six 'suspended' absolutely, and persisting so. Now, of the residue, there are deprived, after notorious inconformity for twelve years together, and final obstinacy, after sundry several monitions; eight excommunicated, for not appearing at the Court; and four inhibited from preaching; of which four, one by his education was a Draper, another was a Weaver, and a third was a Taylor. Where are the 'sixty' now, that you so cry out of?

"I have the rather given you this in the particulars,—which were collected faithfully unto my hands out of the Registry of that Diocese,—that you, and other men, may see your false and unjust clamours: the rather, because it was related to me by a friend of mine in Gloucestershire, that it went current there, amongst your brethren, that your said 'sixty' were 'suspended' for no other cause than for repeating the Doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer. So, for your other number, 'between sixty and eighty suspended' till Christmas—or 'Christ-tide,' as you please to phrase it;—upon examination of the Registers, there appears but eight, and those not all 'suspended' neither; two being excommunicated for not appearing. 'Eighty' and 'eight' do come as near in sound as 'sixty' and 'six' before, but differ more, a great deal, in the calculation! And so much for the grand persecution in the Diocese of Norwich." So says Heylyn, and this is *his* explanation of the case.

Now for his *Master's*. In 1636 Laud laid a Certificate before the King "touching Norwich Diocese," where it is stated that "his Lordship's care hath been such, as that though there are above fifteen hundred clergymen in that Diocese, and many disorders, yet there are not thirty excommunicated, or suspended."^a Next comes Wren's own account, which appears in the shape of a Certificate concerning the Book of Sports: "Anno 1637: Though the 12th Article, that upon inquiry, at my Visitation, whether the King's Majesty's Declaration for the Lawful Sports had been published; I found it had not been done, in very many places of the Diocese: having therefore, about sixty books on hand, I caused them to be proposed to such persons as I had most doubt of, but many of them refused to publish the same, and were suspended for their refusal; yet divers of them presently promised conformity, and were so absolved; so that now, in the whole Diocese, consisting of about fifteen hundred clergymen, there are not passing twice fifteen excommunicated, or suspended; whereof some so stand for contumacy, etc."^b

Wren, who had been Bishop of Norwich from the 10th of November, 1635, to May 5th, 1638, was impeached, December 19th, 1640, the day after that which Laud had also had "a brand of impeachment fixed on him, for high crimes and misdemeanours;"^c and July 5th, 1641, the Committee made its Report of the Charge to the House of Commons, "That the said Matthew Wren, Bishop of Ely, hath

^a "Parentalia: Or, Memoirs of the Family of the Wrens," 1750. fol. p. 48.

^b *Ibid.* p. 64.

^c *Ib.* p. 11.

excommunicated, deprived, or banished, within the space of two years, fifty godly, learned, and painful Ministers." ^a The Articles of Impeachment were transmitted to the Lords, July 20th; and the Thirteenth is, "During his being Bishop of Norwich, which was about two years and four months, he caused fifty Godly Ministers to be excommunicated, suspended, and deprived, for not reading the Service at the Communion Table; for not reading the Book of Sports; for using Conceived Prayers; ^b and for not complying with some other illegal Innovations, to the ruin of their families, whereby some of them were forced to go beyond sea." We copy from his Defence of this Article the following paragraph: "Mr. William Green, Curate of Bromholm, was suspended for many defects, and, among the rest, for want of a clerical habit; but upon his submission, he was presently absolved, and his Licence to preach was only taken from him; he being very illiterate, and having been, of late, by trade a tailor. Of which sort of men many others must come into the reckoning to make up the number of 'fifty' that were under Censure; namely, Mr. Pittman, Curate of Grundsborough, who, not long before, had been a broken tradesman in Ipswich; Mr. Cook, of Fritton, not long before a country apothecary; Mr. Farrar, of Benestall, a weaver, made a Minister; Mr. Bridges, of Wickham-market, no graduate, not long since translated from the common stage-playing to two Cures and a public Lecture. And yet the number will not be made up, as this Defendant believeth, unless there be brought in under the same account, Mr. Potter, Vicar of Kirbrook, where he had not been for seventeen years before; Mr. Smith, Vicar of Memdersley, which he had held above twenty years, and was not in holy Orders of Priesthood: Mr. Norton, Burton, Burrage, Creak, Hurly, Cockerell, Mote, Thomson, Rising, Sherwin, Beavis, Sherwood, Burch, Gray, and others, of whom this Defendant receiving information that they were debauched and scandalous in their courses, by his frequent Letters to the Chancellor, they were brought under Censure." ^c

In answer to the Sixteenth Article of Impeachment; that "By rigorous prosecutions, etc., he caused three thousand of the King's subjects—many of whom using trades, employed a hundred poor people each,—to go into Holland and other places beyond sea, where they have set up and taught the manufactures, to the great hinderance of trade, and impoverishing the people of this kingdom:" ^d Wren makes a statement showing that the number charged did not all go in

^a Parentalia, p. 11.

^b "That monster of 'Conceived Prayer'—pardon the expression, it is not my own—seemed as bad to him as a spell or charm; it must not be used upon any occasion! Without doubt, he would never have been so straitlaced and severe in this particular, if he had but dreamed of that strait which a Minister, a friend of his, was put to by this means. The story is short:—A butcher was gored in the belly by an ox; the wound was cured; the party desired public thanksgiving in the congregation;—the Minister finding no Form for that purpose, read the Collects for Churching of Women!"—Speech of Sir Thomas Widdrington, of Gray's Inn, Recorder of York, &c., at the Conference between both Houses, at the Transmission of the Impeachment against Matthew Wren, D.D. &c.—Parentalia, p. 21.

^c *Ibid.* p. 96.

^d *Ib.* p. 14.

his time, and that the state of trade, caused in part by the plague in London, had compelled numbers to go into Holland; but he comes, nevertheless, to this very striking conclusion here: "The meaner sort, therefore, went chiefly for gains and means of life; the abler sort might also be led away by that, which was operative in any diocese, as in the Diocese of Norwich;—excepting always, to Norwich Diocese a better opportunity of sudden and easy slipping over;—and that was, the utter dislike of all Church Government, and of the Doctrine and Discipline by law here established."^a

How stands the "Case" now, which Heylyn was so forward to "tell?" The discrepancies, all the way through, tend to confirm that Burton is borne out in his general statements; and that what Wren, whom even Clarendon calls "a man of a severe sour nature,"^b set up in his own defence, is a far more severe censure on the state of his Diocese and on the whole Established Church, than is the unofficial relation of his opponents. We need not fear the result of an examination of the narrative of "the falsifier of those times, who was never at a loss, nor ever encumbered with the least diffidence."^c Sir Thomas Widdrington made a just and profound remark, on presenting Wren's Impeachment to the Lords, "An arbitrary Government in the Church," he told them, "is more dangerous, more grievous, than that of the State; it is exercised upon men's consciences, the most tender part, and is the very pinnacle of Tyranny; and, of all other, most intolerable: that blow which will hardly be felt by the arm, will put out the eye!"^d

Laud and Wren, with Heylyn, have now been set in the balance against Burton, and what is the result, but that the colourable ingredients on the side of the Prelates, scarcely affect the preponderance on the opposite side?

Let us see next what the Sixth Chapter produces in the way of exculpation of the "Right Reverends." Heylyn is entitled to the praise, if such he needs, of not going far about, nor being over scrupulous, to find and use terms of reprobation; take, for example, his first sentence in this chapter. "As is the persecution, such are the 'Innovations' also, which you have charged upon the Bishops; both yours, and so both false alike!" We are content that Heylyn's justification of the alleged "Innovations" should abide the like investigation with his defence of the Prelates from the positive charge of persecution; both Heylyn's, "and so both false alike!" That he shoots beside the mark purposely, is sufficiently apparent; and his labour to make out that neither the Doctrine nor the Discipline of the Church was infringed by the then Bishops, is futile and insulting. The man who could suppress truth, and put down argument by the

^a Parentalia, p. 102.

^b Hist. Rebel. vol. i. bk. ii. p. 83. edit. *fo.* 1702.

^c Archdeacon Blackburne, "Confessional." edit. 3. 1770. 8vo. p. 189. He says also, in p. 165, that Peter Heylyn was "a man lost to all sense of truth and modesty, when the interests or claims of the Church came in question." Lest any authority short of a Bishop's should be disregarded, we produce one who tells us "Our first Reformers, out of Peter Heylyn's angry, and to our Church and truth, scandalous writings, are made fanatics." Bishop Earlow's Genuine Remains. 1693. 8vo. p. 181.

^d Parentalia. p. 20.

arrogance of authority alone, is not worthy of that attention which is due to a candid and disinterested opponent. How fallacious Heylyn's appeal to authority is, he has enabled us to exemplify in an instance of so singular a character as makes it marvellous that his "*Justum Volumen*," so called by his master,^a should flatly contradict what that imperious master had set down for truths. But let us see first what Heylyn says.

"For standing up at the Gospel, it was enjoined expressly, in the Liturgy of King Edward VI., and practised also, though not prescribed under that now in use amongst us. Bishop Jewel, as you see, allows it; with whom you are not worthy to be named the same day. And for the practice of it, take this of Hooker, 'Because the Gospels which are weekly read, do all historically declare something which our Lord Jesus Christ himself either spake, did, or suffered, in his own person, it hath been the custom of Christian men then especially, in token of the greater reverence, to stand, to utter certain words of acclamation, and *at* the name of Jesus to bow: which harmless ceremonies,' as he tells us, there was not any man '*constrained* to use;' ^b nor was it *necessary*; all sorts of people using them without constraint, till you and your forefather, Cartwright,^c made scruple of it."

See now what a greater than Heylyn says the other way. Quoting Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions of 1559, No. 52, in his Speech in the Star Chamber, June 14, 1637; that "Whensoever the name of Jesus shall be in any Lesson, Service, or otherwise pronounced in the Church—it is enjoined—that due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowliness of courtesy, and uncovering of the heads of mankind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong, and heretofore hath been accustomed:" So," says Laud, "here is *necessity* laid upon it, and custom for it, and both by express Authority!" ^d

"Who shall decide when doctors disagree?"

Heylyn commences his Seventh Chapter with cavilling at Burton's inadvertence, if so it be, where charging the Prelates with Innovations, he instances "the altering of Prayer Books *set forth* by public authority," and again, "*set forth*" by Parliament; a phrase which Heylyn claims for "discreet Bishops, and other learned men of this realm; and being so '*set forth*,' was by authority of Parliament confirmed and ratified, as it related to the subject:" presently, he says, "Being '*set forth*,' then, by the Clergy, it was, as you inform us, '*commanded* to be read without any alteration;' that was, indeed, done by authority of Parliament." From such fast and loose dealing, we pass; but not to stop either at Heylyn's arbitrary doctrine, "that out of doubt the Puritan religion is rebellion," and "their faith faction," because

^a Laud's Speech in the Star Chamber, 1637, p. 73.

^b Eccles. Polity, bk. v. sect. 30, vol. ii. p. 106, Hanbury's edit. 1830.

^c When the Injunctions were issued, Cartwright was scarcely in vogue.

^d Speech, p. 31. See also Canon xviii. 1603. "When in time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as hath been accustomed." Though this, from its date, excuses Hooker, yet what can be said for Heylyn?

Burton had "condemned that *absolute obedience* unto Kings and Princes, which," says Heylyn, "is due to them from their subjects; and that *unlimited power*, which is," says Heylyn too, "ascribed unto them, because theirs of right!"

It may be amusing to notice the difficulties and evasions of the Prelatists on certain occasions; as, for instance, well knowing that the Canons of 1603 have never been "confirmed and ratified by *Parliament*," and that therefore they bind the Clergy only, who alone swear to observe them, Heylyn having to vindicate their "bowing *at* the name of Jesus," says it is enjoined by the 18th Canon, which being authorized by his Majesty, is the law of the *King*." Another turn which Heylyn takes to extricate his party from the charge of having brought in "changes," is that what they did was through "the law of God, the King, and the Act of Parliament, either enabling them to do so, or *not gainsaying it*:" a loop-hole wide enough to let in all sorts of "Innovations." Tradition and the Decrees of the Church, and the Infallibility of Councils, all find a safe shelter under the wing of this negative clause. Let one be heard, however, who paid no little deference to the reverend authority of Bishops; he says, "That Authority of men should prevail with men either against or above Reason, is no part of our belief. Companies of learned men, be they never so great and reverend, are to yield unto Reason, the weight whereof is no whit prejudiced by the simplicity of his person which doth allege it; but being found to be sound and good, the bare opinion of men to the contrary must of necessity stop and give place."^a

Arrived at Heylyn's eighteen pages of "Conclusion," they deserve no further notice than what the arrogance they contain demands. "For your odious supposition^b of setting up Mass in the King's Chapel, let me tell you this,—that it is criminal, if not capital, to use *ifs* and *ands* and *suppositions* in matters of so high a nature, and such as, in some cases,^c hath been judged high treason!" But worse than treason: "So," says he, "for your dealing with the Bishops, you labour to expose them as much as in you is!" After all, by a sort of special distinction in favour of Burton, or by way of peculiar condescension in regard of themselves, Laud, Heylyn, and Company, announce to the "poor ignorant men," who were too ready to devour what was "spread abroad, by malicious wits, of purpose to defame their betters," that "However it was thought unfit, that at this present time, an Answer should be made unto all your quarrels, that so the people whom you have seduced might see the error of their courses; yet neither you nor they must expect the like on all or any of those factious provocations which, every day are offered to the public government. Things that are once established by a constant law, are not at all to be disputed, much less declaimed against; or if they be, will find more shelter from the laws than from their advocates. These scandalous and seditious

^a Hooker, Eccles. Pol. bk. ii. sec. 7, vol. i. p. 183. edit. 1830.

^b Burton had said, "Suppose,—which we trust never to see, and which our hearts abhor once to imagine,—Mass were set up in the King's Chapel; is this a good argument why it should be admitted in all the Churches?" P. 166.

^c Alluding to Sir William Stanley; History of Henry VII., by Lord Bacon.

pamphlets are now grown so rife, that every day, as if we lived in the wilds of Africa, doth produce new monsters, there being more of them divulged, at this present time, than any former age can speak of; more of these factious spirits *quam muscarum olim cum caletur maxime*, than there are scarabees, and gad-flies, in the heat of summer! And should the State [!] think fit that every libel of yours, and such men as you, should have a solemn Answer to it, you would advance your heads too high, and think you had done something more than ordinary which should necessitate the State [!] to set out Apologies. That, as it would encourage you to pursue your courses, so would it suddenly dissolve the whole frame of Government; which is as much endangered by such disputations as by disobedience. And yet I would not have you think that you are like to find those days whereof Tacitus speaks, *ubi et sentire quæ velis, et quæ sentias loqui liceat*; ^a in which, you may be bold to opine what you list, and speak whatever you conceive; much less, to scatter and disperse in public whatever you dare speak in private. Princes have otherways to right themselves, and those which are in authority under them, than by the pen; and such as will fall heavier, if you pull them on you. . . If Authority hath stooped so low this once, to give way that your seditious pamphlets should come under an examination, and that an Answer should be made to all the scandalous matters in the same contained, I would not have you think it was for any other cause but that your Proselytes may perceive what false guides they follow; and all the world may see, how much you have abused the King and his Ministers with your scandalous clamours: which done, and all those cavils answered which you have been so long providing, it is expected, at their hands, that they rest satisfied in and of the Church's purposes in every of the things objected; and look not after fresh Replies upon like occasions."

As we introduced this work of Heylyn's to our readers, with a quotation from Milton, so we shall follow it with another, characteristic of its author. The "grim wolf," or victim of the "two-handed engine,"—the uplifted axe, or two-handed sword,—little suspected what his measures would end in before about eight short years should be passed over; unless the memorable lines about to be quoted might have aroused some compunctious misgiving, when perusing—for surely nothing escaped his *paw*—Milton's monody on his youthful friend, his "Lycidas," ^b drowned in 1637, while crossing the Irish Channel; wherein "by occasion" is *foretold* "the ruin of our corrupted Clergy, then in their height." He puts into the mouth of St. Peter—

"How well could I have spar'd for thee, young swain,
Enow of such as for their bellies' sake
Creep, and intrude, and climb into the fold?
Of other care, they little reck'ning make,
Than how to scramble at the shearers' feast,
And shove away the worthy, bidden, guest.
Blind mouths! that scarce themselves know how to hold
A sheep-hook, or have learn'd aught else the least
That to the faithful herdman's art belongs!

^a Hist. lib. i.

^b Written in Nov., 1637. Edward, son of Sir John King, Knt., Secretary for Ireland, was drowned Aug. 10, 1637, aged 25.

What reck's it them? What need they? They are sped;
 And, when they list, their lean and flashy songs
 Grate on their scrannel pipes of wretched straw;
 The hungry sheep look up, and are not fed,
 But, swoln with wind, and the rank mist they draw,
 Rot inwardly, and foul contagion spread:
 Besides what the grim wolf, with privy paw,
 Daily devours apace, and nothing said:
 But that two-handed engine at the door
 Stands ready to smite once, and smite no more!"

"In these lines," says Dr. Thomas Warton, "our author anticipates the execution of Archbishop Laud... It is matter of surprise," he adds, "that this violent invective against the Church of England and the Hierarchy, couched indeed in terms a little mysterious, yet sufficiently intelligible, and covered by a transparent veil of allegory, should have been published under the sanction, and from the press, of one of our Universities; or that it should afterwards have escaped the severest animadversions, at a period when the proscriptions of the Star Chamber, and the power of Laud, were at their height."^a

CHAP. XXXV.

NINE POSITIONS SENT TO NEW ENGLAND.—ANSWER.—REPLY.

THIS year, 1637, a Letter was addressed by "Many" Puritan "Ministers" at home, to "their Brethren," as they styled them, in New England; requesting their "judgment" on "Nine Positions" proposed to those Brethren.^b That carrying away from their native country minds freed from the trammels which bound them from speaking and acting but within, at best, a sort of conventional sphere; and each one using his privilege, accordingly, to avow his sentiments and to carry out his principles concerning all matters of Church-polity; the New England Exiles should, after awhile, have diverged widely from their former customs, would seem to follow as a necessary consequence. The jealous watchfulness with which their every movement was regarded, might have been expected from parental and fraternal allies not yet released from the shackles in which prejudice had fixed them; but that reproaches should be wafted across the intervening ocean, could only have proceeded from the servile adherents of prescription! Which party of these twain most concerned themselves about the expatriated "Reverend and Beloved Brethren," let the "Letter" itself show.

"WHILE we lived together in the same Kingdom, we professed the same faith; joined in the same ordinances; laboured, in the work of God, to gain souls unto his kingdom, and maintained the purity of worship against corruptions both on the right hand and on the left. But since your departure into New England, we hear, and partly believe, that divers have embraced certain opinions such as you disliked formerly, and we judge to be groundless and unwarrantable."^c

^a Todd's Milton, 1809, vol. vi. p. 41, 42, and notes there.

^b The title of the volume is given in another place, see p. 22, note.

^c The Positions will be found in their order, hereafter.

"These, and other such like, which we omit to reckon up, are written and reported to be the common tenets in New England; which are received with great applause, maintained with great confidence, and applauded as the only Church-way wherein the Lord is to be worshipped! And Letters from New England have so taken with divers in many parts of this kingdom, that they have left our Assemblies because of a Stinted Liturgy; and excommunicated themselves from the Lord's Supper because of such as are not debarred from it: and being turned aside themselves, they labour to ensnare others; to the grief of the godly, the scandal of religion, the wounding of their own souls, if they did advisedly consider the matter, and great advantage of them that are wily to espy, and ready to make use of, all advantages to prejudice the truth.

"Beloved Brethren! if you stood in our places, we are well assured it would be no small grief unto you, to hear and see the people led aside, to the disgrace of the Gospel, upon weak and groundless imaginations; and, in rash and inconsiderate zeal, to deal with that which is of God as if it were of man! And if it be to us grief of heart, to hear that you have changed from that Truth which you did profess, and embrace that for Truth which, in former times upon sound grounds you did condemn as erroneous, we hope you will not be offended. You know how oft it hath been objected, 'that Nonconformists in practice are Separatists in heart,' but that they go cross to their own positions, or smother the Truth for sinister ends. They of the Separation boast that they stand upon the Nonconformists' grounds: a vain-glorious flourish, and slight pretence! But both these are much countenanced by your sudden change, if you be changed as it is reported. How shall your Brethren be able to stand up in defence of their innocency and the uprightness of their cause, when your example and opinion shall be cast in their dish? Must they leave you now, with whom they have held society? Or, will you plead for Separation, which you have condemned as rash and inconsiderate? You know that they who have run this way, have fallen into manifold divisions; and may not you justly fear lest the same befall you? Some warnings you have had already; and have you not cause to fear, every day, more and more? Error is very fruitful, and will speed apace. A crack in the foundation may occasion a wide breach in the building where there will not be means, or mind, to amend it. Experience, every day, may tutor us herein.

"But to let pass all inconveniences, our request, in all meekness and love, is, That if these, or any of the forementioned opinions, be indeed your tenets, you would be pleased to take a second review of your grounds; and send us your strongest reasons that have swayed you in these matters. And if we shall find them, upon due examination, to be such as will carry weight, we shall be ready to give you the right hand of fellowship: if otherwise, you shall receive our just and modest animadversions, in what we conceive you have erred from the Truth.

"You will not judge, if we cannot apprehend the strength of your grounds, it is because we love not the Truth; or, be carried with by-respects; though these conceits prevail too much: such rigid and harsh censures cannot lodge in meek and humble breasts. Weighty reasons promote the Truth; not unadvised judging. You, yourselves, have judged that to be error which, now, you take to be truth, when yet you were not blinded with by-respects, nor your eyes hood-winked that you might not see the light! And if you have just warrant from God, to pull down what you have builded, and to build what you have pulled down; we desire you would lovingly, and maturely, impart it: for, as yet, we have seen none which we are not ready to prove, and show by the rule of Truth, to be too weak to carry any burden. We adore, with you, the fulness of the Scripture, and we know, 'the counsel of the Lord shall stand.' If you can show that you walk in the ways of God, we shall heartily rejoice to walk with you: but, if you have turned aside, we shall earnestly desire that you would be pleased seriously to consider the matter, and speedily reform what is out of order.

"Thus, not doubting of your favourable interpretation of this our motion for the preventing of distraction, maintenance of peace, and searching out of the Truth, whereby we may be directed to live to the praise of God, the good of his people, and comfort of our souls; beseeching God to lead and guide us into all truth and holiness, and keep us blameless until his glorious appearance; we rest—Your Loving Brethren."

Although the Answer of the Elders of the Churches in New England, is stated to have been returned, *anno* 1639, we shall not, on account of the benefit derivable from contiguity, interpose any matter between the Answer and the Letter which produced it, especially as the Answer does not involve facts which interfere with the course of events at home.

“ Reverend and Beloved Brethren,—In these remote coasts of the earth whereunto the good hand of God hath brought us, as we do, with much comfort of heart, call to mind the many gracious blessings which, both with you and from you, we enjoyed in our Christian and holy communion,—the memory and fruit whereof we hope shall never be blotted out;—so we have, also, seen cause to look back to our former administrations there, and to ‘search and try our ways,’^a that whereinsoever we have formerly gone astray, we might judge ourselves for it before the Lord. And, that seeing now God hath set before us an open door of liberty, we might neither abuse our liberty in the Gospel, to run out into any groundless, unwarrantable, courses, nor neglect the present opportunity to administer, by the help of Christ, all the holy ordinances of God, according to the pattern set before us in the Scripture.

“ In our native country, when we were first called to the Ministry, many of us took some things to be indifferent and lawful, which, in after times, we saw to be sinful; and durst not continue in the practice of them there. Afterwards, some things that we bare as burdens, that is, as things inexpedient though not utterly unlawful, we have no cause to retain and practise the same things here; which would have been not only inexpedient but unlawful. Such things as a man may tolerate when he cannot remove them, he cannot tolerate without sin when he may remove them. Besides, some things we practised there,—which we speak to our shame and grief,—we never took into serious consideration whether they were lawful and expedient or not; but took them for granted, and generally received not only by the most Reformed Churches, but by the most godly and judicious servants of God amongst them; which, nevertheless, when we came to weigh them in the balance of the sanctuary, we could not find sufficient warrant, in the Word, to receive them and establish them here. Of one of these three kinds will our present practices appear to be, which you call our ‘new [vain] opinions,’ or innovations here: except it be some few of them, which, though they have been reported to you to be our judgements and practice, yet are indeed far from us!

“ The particulars are too many and too weighty to give you account of them, and the grounds of our proceedings about them, in a Letter. But to give you, if it be the will of God, the better satisfaction, we have sent you a short treatise touching each particular; that, according to your desire, you might understand from us, how far we do acknowledge any of these tenets, and upon what ground: hoping that according to your promise, if ‘upon due examination’ you shall find any ‘weight’ in them, you will give us ‘the right hand of fellowship;’ but, ‘if otherwise,’ you will send us your ‘just and faithful [modest] animadversions.’ And we do not suspect your loves to the truth, or your sincere speaking according to

^aLam. iii. 40.

your conscience in the sight of God ; neither tax we you as siding from the truth ‘with by-respects,’ whereof you complain : verily we abhor such rash, hard, and presumptuous censoriousness ! We see as much cause to suspect the integrity of our own hearts, as yours ; and so much the more as being more privy to the deceitfulness of our own hearts than of yours. And we cannot but with much thankfulness of heart acknowledge the many rich, precious treasures of his grace wherewith the Lord hath furnished sundry of you above your Brethren ; which causeth us, with great reverence to accept and receive what further ‘light’ God may be pleased to impart unto us by you ! But, as we have believed, so have we hitherto practised ; and so have most of us spoken this our Answer to your Particulars : most of us, we may say, because there want not some Brethren amongst us who proceed further, even to look at all set-forms of Prayer invented by men of another age or congregation, and prescribed to their Brethren to be read out of a Book for the Prayers of the Church, as ‘images’ or imaginations of men, forbidden in the Second Commandment : but as we leave them to the liberty of their own judgments, without prejudice ; so do we also concur with the rest of them, so far as we all go, in bearing witness against any set-forms, or the corruptions in them. In dispatching whereof, we have been the more slow, because it behoved us first to inquire into, and to settle, some controversies amongst ourselves, before we could well attend to entertain discourse about foreign questions which do not so nearly concern our present estate and practice. Besides, your Letters being sent to the Ministers of the Churches, and some of them dwelling far asunder, it was not an easy thing for all of us often to meet together to consider of these questions ; much less, to resolve upon one just [joint] answer. But having at length, by the assistance of God, brought our answer to this issue, we commend it to the blessing of the Lord, and, in him, to your christian and judicious consideration ; where, if all things be found safe and duly warranted from Scripture grounds, do you also, as beseemeth vigilant watchmen of the Lord’s flock, and faithful witnesses to God, if any thing seem doubtful to you, consider and weigh it very well before you reject it ! If any thing appear to be unsound and dissonant from the Word,—which we, for our parts, cannot discover,—we shall willingly attend to what further ‘light’ God may send unto us by you.

“ In the meanwhile, we entreat you, in the Lord, not to suffer such apprehensions to lodge in your minds which you intimate in your Letters ; as if we here justified the ways of rigid Separation which sometimes, amongst you, we have formerly borne witness against, and so build again the things we have destroyed. You know they separate from your Congregations, as no Churches ; from the Ordinances dispensed by you, as mere Antichristian ; and from yourselves, as no visible Christians : but we profess unfeignedly, we separate from the corruptions which we conceive to be left in your Churches, and from such Ordinances administered therein as we fear are not of God but of men : and for yourselves, we are so far from separating as from no visible Christians, as that you are, under God, in our hearts,—if the Lord would suffer it,—to live and die together. And we look at sundry of you as

men of that eminent growth in Christianity, that, if there be any visible Christians under heaven, amongst you are the men which, for these many years, have been written in your foreheads, 'Holiness to the Lord;' which we speak not to prejudice any Truth which ourselves are here taught and called to profess; but we still believe, though personal Christians may be eminent in their growth of Christianity, yet Churches had still need to grow from apparent defects to purity, and from reformation to reformation, age after age, till the Lord have utterly abolished Antichrist 'with the breath of his mouth', and 'the brightness of his coming',^a to the full and clear revelation of all His holy truth; especially touching the ordering of His house and public worship. As a pledge of this our estimation of you, and sincere affection to you, we have sent these answers to your demand; and shall be ready, by the help of Christ, to receive back again from you, wise, and just, and holy advertisements in the Lord.

"Now, the Lord God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, your Lord and ours, lead us into all truth; purge out all leaven out of His Churches; and keep us blameless and harmless in His holy faith and fear, to His heavenly kingdom, through Him that hath loved us: in whom we rest—your very loving Brethren, The Elders of the Churches in New England."

It is impossible not to be interested in a Letter so temperate and yet so firm; in which reproof is so justly administered, and yet is so conciliatory; written, as the Replies admit, "in great love and tenderness;" as is that which accompanied the "Short Treatise" now to be attended to, and which comprises the combined and deliberate judgment of the Expatriated Brethren upon the "Nine Positions." If not all, so much of the Treatise will be produced as bears upon the particulars imputed to, or charged upon, the Transatlantic Divines; and at the foot, in the margin, will be found what it is deemed expedient not to pass over in the "Reply" of the Divines at home, or rather of one of those Divines: for, after the title-page of the volume,^b the parties who superintended its publication inform "the Reader" that "upon the receipt of the 'Answer' returned unto the 'Nine Positions,' Master Ball,^c moved by request of Brethren, drew up this Reply, which, upon perusal and joint approbation, was directed unto the Reverend Elders of the several Churches in New-England." The first copy of the Reply having miscarried in 1640, another copy was "prepared in the year following;" and the whole collection bears the "Imprimatur" of James

^a 2 Thess. ii. 8.

^b "A Letter of Many Ministers in Old England, requesting the judgment of their Reverend Brethren in New England, concerning Nine Positions: Written A.D. 1637. Together with their Answer thereto, returned *anno* 1639; and, the Reply made unto the said Answer, and sent over unto them, *anno* 1640.—Now published, by occasion mentioned in the Epistle to the Reader, following in the next page, upon the desire of many godly and faithful Ministers, in and about the City of London, who love and seek the Truth: By Simeon Ash, and William Rathband.—1 Thess. v. 21. 1643." 4to. pp. 90.

^c John Ball, A. M., many years Minister at Whitmore, near Newcastle, in Staffordshire. See Brooke's *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 440. Other notices of Ball will come before us.

Cranford, July 5th, 1643. We were surprised at finding the editors assert that "it is manifest who are volunteers, and who are pressed to come forth as defendants in these controversies;" and could not make it intelligible to ourselves but by supposing that a "For" is required to serve as the introduction to this next sentence: [For] "these differences betwixt the loving Brethren of Old England and New, had not been made thus notorious, if some who cry up the Church-way in New-England as the only way of God, had not been found to blow them abroad in the world."

"The Answer of the Reverend Brethren in New England.

"First Position: 'That a Stinted Form of Prayer and Set Liturgy is unlawful.'

"Ans.—Before we proceed to declare ourselves concerning this position; . . we suppose, First, by a Liturgy and Form of Prayer, you mean not a Form of private Prayers; but a system or body of Public Prayers generally used in the English Parishes, compiled for the Church's use by other men not infallibly guided by God. . . Now, we know not of any other 'Stinted Liturgy' from which people do absent themselves. . . For, as for a Form of Prayer in general, . . it is evident that many Preachers constantly use one set form of prayer of their own making, before their Sermons, with which the people refuse not to join. Secondly, By 'Stinted and Set' you mean such Prayers as are so *imposed* upon the Churches and Ministers as that they are limited to that very form of words. . . Thirdly. By 'Unlawful,' you mean that we, looking at that Form as swerving from the [Scripture] Rule, neither dare practise it ourselves, nor approve the use of it by others. . .

"We answer, For our own practice, the Churches here do not use any 'Stinted Form of Prayer and Set Liturgy;' for these and other such reasons, [namely,] because we find no necessity, . . by virtue of any Divine precept; and, seeing the commission of the Apostles limited them to teach men 'to observe' and do only what Christ did command them,^a . . who are we, and what are our Churches, that we should presume above this commission? And, we hope it will not be offensively taken by any Godly Brethren, that we 'stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free'^b in this as well as in other things. Because [again] the lawfulness of 'Set Forms and Stinted Liturgies' is questioned and doubted by many faithful servants of God! Whereas, for Church officers to edify the Churches by their own gifts, as well in praying as in preaching, all sorts without controversy grant. . . Now, spiritual prudence guideth . . to choose that which is safe. . . Because, primitive patterns of all the Churches of God in their best times, . . yield not the least footsteps to show us another safe way! . . As for after-times, towards the end of the second and beginning of the third centuries, we know how far the Churches were then degenerated; . . and it was foretold^c that 'the power' of Godliness^d would be in after-times, exchanged for empty Forms! In which respect we look not on them, as our Guides neither in this nor other particulars not warranted by the Rule [of Scripture], herein following the advice of Cyprian who himself

^a Matt xxviii. 20. ^b Gal. v. 1. ^c 2 Tim. iii. 1. ^d ver. 5.

saw the corruptions of those times, *Non est attendendum quid aliquis ante nos faciendum putaverit, sed quid qui ante omnes est Christus fecerit et faciendum præceperit.* To conclude, seeing our Christian 'liberty' freeth us from binding ourselves; . . and seeing, 'spiritual prudence' directs us; . . and seeing it will not be 'safe' for us needlessly to swerve from the constant practice of all Churches that are recorded in Scripture; . . we, therefore, may not, do not, dare not, use 'Set Forms of Prayers and Stinted Liturgies.' . .

"More particularly; in that we do not use that Form of Prayer and Stinted Liturgy which is in use among yourselves; these and such other like reasons have induced us. . . First, the many and just exceptions whereunto that liturgy is liable, both for matter and manner! For the proof whereof, we refer you to those faithful servants of God who have gone before us in witnessing against the same: amongst others, Mr. Cartwright, and the 'Abridgment.' Secondly, inasmuch as that liturgy was never 'commanded' of God, and hath been greatly abused to idolatry and superstition, and is not of any necessary use; and therefore, we are afraid to bring it into the worship of God, as knowing the jealousy of the Lord in matters of this nature!^a . . And that that liturgy hath been superstitiously abused may be clear to any that shall consider that it is the same, for substance, that was used in the days of Popery. . . And many of the people put such holiness in it, that they think God is not rightly worshipped, nor his Sabbath well observed, nor the Sacraments sufficiently administered, if there be no reading of that service. . . Thirdly, in regard of the many woeful scandals and dangerous consequences of using that liturgy! . . To mention but two, namely, the hardening of papists, who are emboldened to think better of their own breviaries, mass-books, portuisses; seeing that liturgy hath been extracted out of those books, and rather fetched from them than from the forms used in any of the Reformed Churches: The countenancing and establishing of an unlearned *idol* Ministry of Not-preaching-curates, Non-residents, Pluralists, etc. . . Fourthly, seeing that Book is so imposed as that the Minister . . is limited to the very words set down; . . therefore, we dare not use it! For the Lord himself hath not limited His people to his own forms, and therefore we see not how it can be lawful, to be limited to others' forms. . . We do not find that the Apostles ever used that form taught by Christ, in those very words; much less, limited themselves to it, when they prayed; nor did they teach the Churches so to do! If the Lord would not have us limit ourselves in our own forms, while we are exercising our own gifts,—which he hath specially sanctified to edify his Church,^b—lest we should 'quench,' or at least straiten his Spirit, in prayer;^c would He, then, have us limited to others' forms which have not been, in like sort, sanctified of God, but will rather 'quench' or straiten the Spirit of God while we are so limited to them? The entertainment of this [Anglican] form hath been a manifest snare unto the Churches, who, upon the same grounds on which they have received this form into the Desks,

^a Exod. xx. v., with fifteen other Scripture references.

^b Acts, vi. 4. Eph. iv. 8. 1 Cor. xii. 7.

^c 1 Thess. v. 19.

have been limited to others in the Pulpit: by means whereof the poor Church of Christ hath been wholly deprived of the public use of the Ministers' gifts in prayer; and the spirit of prayer, in the Ministers, in public, hath been greatly restrained.^a

"As for our judgment concerning the practice of others who use this liturgy, in our native country; we have always been unwilling to express our minds there [against this use of it] unless we have been necessarily called thereunto:^b and at this time, we think it not expedient to express ourselves any further concerning this matter, as loath to intermeddle with the affairs of other Churches, but contenting ourselves with, and blessing the Lord for, those *liberties* which we by the mercy of God, do here enjoy; reserving also due reverence to the judgments of our beloved Brethren and dear countrymen who may, concerning this matter, be otherwise minded."^c

^a "By statute 1 Eliz. cap. ii. sec. 4, still unrepealed as it regards the Dissenting Clergy, they are obnoxious to prosecution in all cases, for omitting in their public exercises to use the Service of the Established Church, or for using any other Service not enjoined by law; and are liable for the second offence, to imprisonment for life." A Summary of Laws peculiarly affecting Protestant Dissenters. By Jos. Beldam. 1827. 12mo. p. 8.

^b This is the first intimation which has attracted our notice, of specific objection against the prescribed Service-book or the symbol of State-religionists being, as it were, surreptitiously used by unauthorized communities! How far the present Church of England can justify their own use of it, is a question between them and their prototypes.

^c "REPLY.—This Position cannot bear that meaning which you give it. . . The thing we craved resolution in was, Whether, in your judgments, *all* Stinted and Set Forms of Prayer and Liturgies be unlawful? The reason hereof was because in writings from New England, we had seen *all* Set Liturgies and Set Forms of Prayer condemned as 'devised worship, which God would not accept;' and, partaking in the Sacrament of the Supper in our Assemblies therefore disallowed, because administered in a Stinted Liturgy! Which things were received with such liking amongst some Brethren with us; and, by them, imparted and recommended to others; that they occasioned that rent and distraction whereof we complain. It is true, the people, among us, separate from our Form of Prayer, or Liturgy; but the reason hereof is because it is 'Stinted,' not because this, or that, or ours, in particular. You confess you want not some Brethren, among you, who 'look at all Set Forms of Prayer, invented by men of *another* age or congregation, and prescribed; . . as images and imaginations of men, forbidden in the Second Commandment.' . . And if we examine the reasons brought against '*Stinted*' Forms and Liturgies, we shall find them strike at *all* Forms and Liturgies, though devised by men of the *same* age and Congregation! . . The '*Brownists*,' as they are commonly called, can separate from no '*Stinted* Liturgy' amongst us but that which is in use; and for aught we know, they may join with their own Pastors, though they oft use the same form of Prayer, in whole or in part, in thanksgiving before meat, or in prayer before Sermon, or the like. And yet their opinion is that *all* '*Stinted* Liturgies and Set Forms of Prayer,' be unlawful, human inventions, forbidden by the Second Commandment. . . The reasons you bring against a '*Set Form* of Prayer or Liturgy' do hold as strongly against a '*Set Form*' of Catechism, Confession and Profession of Faith, Blessing, Baptising, and Singing of Psalms. We have not called upon you, at this time, to witness for or against the corruptions in the Communion-Book: this you fall upon by straining the sense of our demands. . . You are generally, as you say, '*loath*' to meddle '*with the affairs of other Churches*,' unless you have been necessarily called thereunto.' But when some—upon the request, as we suppose, of private friends; and others, out of their zeal and forwardness,—have laboured to

“Second Position: ‘That it is not lawful to join in Prayer, or to receive the Sacrament, where a Stinted Liturgy is used.’ Or, as we conceive your meaning to be in this, as in the former question, namely, *where* and *when* that ‘Stinted Liturgy’ is used!

“Ans.—It seemeth, by this your Letter, the ground of this Position hath been the separation of divers from your assemblies, because of a ‘Stinted Liturgy:’ and we are not ignorant of the rigid separation of divers people who withdraw themselves from an able faithful ministry, as no ministry of Christ; and from their godly congregations, as no churches of Christ; because of some corruptions, from which, through want of light, not love of the truth, they are not thoroughly cleansed. Against which practice we have ever witnessed. . . Now, if the question be, of joining in Prayer with, and when that *whole* Liturgy is used; or, where that which is used, is read by an unable and un-godly Minister; we then see not, how it can be ‘lawful to join in Prayer’ in such cases: for, first, The Prayers of the Minister, are not his private prayers, but the Public Prayers of the whole Assembly, whose mouth he is to God. And when the prayers offered up by the Minister as a living, holy, and acceptable service to God, are not, through human frailty, but otherwise, for matter and manner corrupt, we see not what warrant any one hath to join with such Prayers: Mal. i. 13, 14. Secondly, When men join therein, with an insufficient Ministry, they do not only countenance them in their place and office whom the Lord hath ‘rejected’ from being his Priests, Hos. iv. 6; but also set up those idols and means of worship to edify themselves by, which God never appointed in his holy Word: Ezek. xi. 17 [xiv. 3.] But if the question be, of joining in some few *select* Prayers read by an able and painful Minister out of that book: as on the one side, we are very tender of imputing sin to the men that so join; so, on the other side, we are not without fear lest that such joining may be found to be ‘unlawful:’ unless it may appear that the Ministers with whom the people have communion in reading those Prayers, do neither give any scandal by reading of them, nor give unlawful honour to a thing abused to idolatry and superstition, nor do suffer themselves to be sinfully limited in the reading of them!”^a

draw many to separation from the Sacrament, because ministered in a ‘Stinted Liturgy:’ we cannot apprehend any just ground of this apology. The rent is wide, and some Brethren had their hands deep therein; which made us, at this present, to crave your judgments, and the reasons thereof, to make up the breach.” . .

^a “Reply.— . . If we have not mistaken your judgment and practice both, you have borne witness against both that you call ‘the rigid Separation’ and this more moderate also. And we humbly wish the moderate do not degenerate unto the ‘rigid’ ere long. It is very strange, if they take not great encouragement upon your grounds! The truth of our ministry, churches, ordinances, and calling, is questioned; and where men will stay the Lord knoweth: and what more common than that our Liturgy is ‘unlawful because it is the device of *man*?’ The author, or publisher at least, of a Letter against our Service Book [‘A Letter lately published against Stinted Liturgies:’ thus, in Ball’s ‘Friendly Trial,’ p. 8, *ut infra*] beginneth with such like distinction. ‘Against this Prayer Book,’ saith he, ‘divers have pleaded, in a different manner: First; Some arguments are proper to the Separatists; *qua tales*, namely, first, That it is offered in a False Church: secondly, By a False Minister: thirdly, In the behalf of the subjects of the

“Third and Fourth Positions: ‘That the Children of godly and approved Christians are not to be baptized until their Parents be set Members of some Particular Congregation.’—‘That the Parents themselves, though of approved piety, are not to be received to the Lord’s Supper, until they be admitted as set Members.’

“Ans.—These two Positions may be maintained with one and the same defence: . . . therefore, take notice, that we are not of their judgment who refuse all religious communion with such as are not Church-members; nor do we appropriate Communion, in this privilege of the Seals only to the Members of our own Churches, excluding all other Churches of Christ from the same, though they may be, through error or human frailty, defective in some matters of Order; provided that the liberty of our Churches be preserved, of receiving such satisfaction as is meet,—as well by letters of recommendation, or otherwise, if it be requisite,—concerning those whom we admit unto fellowship in the Seals. For, as we account it our duty to keep ‘the unity’ of spirit inviolate with any in whom we discern any fruits ‘of the Spirit,’ Eph. iv. 3, so we hold ourselves bound to discharge this duty according to Order. Spiritual communion, in prayers, holy conferences, and other religious actions of like nature, we maintain with all godly persons, though they be not in church order: but church communion we hold only with Church Members; admitting to fellowship of the Seals the known and approved and orderly recommended Members of any true Church; but into fellowship of the Censures, admittance of Members, and choice of Officers, only the Members of that Particular Church

kingdom of Antichrist! These are properly theirs; being the grounds whereupon they make a total Separation from all the Churches in this Land, as no Churches of Christ. [The reader will not be misled by the use of the plural ‘churches,’ in this connexion; as all the parish churches comprise but one Church.] These I approve not, yet note them that ye may see upon what different grounds the same Position is maintained by several persons; and that ye may be delivered from the prejudice which hinders many from receiving those truths, because they fear the reproach of ‘Brownism.’ Secondly; There are other grounds which are common to all that plead for the purity of Christ’s Ordinances, and which do not necessarily infer such Separation; but only serve to show the unlawfulness of that practice, and of our continuing therein.’ . . . The ‘grounds’ on which that author builds, which, he saith, ‘are common to all that plead for the purity of God’s Ordinances,’ are one and the same with the ‘grounds’ of the Separatists: shafts taken out of the same quiver, and peculiar to them; some few Brethren only excepted, who, of late, have looked towards that opinion. See how affection will transport! . . . The Book,—we speak of the Liturgy, so far as it is sound and good,—by your confession is no Idolothite: neither was it taken out of the Mass-book, in such sense as you object; but rather, the Mass and other idolatrous Prayers were added to it, for Popery is as a scab or leprosy cleaving to the Church; and many truths belonging to the Church, as her proper legacy, were stolen, and heaped together in that den. And why the true man may not challenge his goods wherever he finds them; or the thief plead title to the true man’s goods by prescription; we know not. . . . [This argument would seem to tend to deprive even the Church of England of her exclusive hold upon the appropriated remains of antiquity.] We have heard that you hold fellowship with professed ‘rigid’ Separatists, without any acknowledgement of their error, and receive them as members, or communicate with them in the privileges of the Church, though you profess you approve not their opinion or practice; and if, in godly wisdom, you can see ‘grounds’ to join with them, we marvel you should be so timorous in this particular!” . . .

whereof they and we, any of us, stand Members. These things being premised, the Considerations whereupon our judgment and practice are swayed for administration of the Seals only to such as are in Order of a true visible Church, are these that follow.^a

“First Consideration: The Seals . . . are given to the Church as a privilege peculiar thereto, in ordinary dispensation. Indeed, the Preaching of the Word is not so, being an Ordinance given not only for the edifying of the Church already gathered; but, also, for the gathering of men to the Churches, that yet are without. . . . And because there is now no *universal* visible Church on earth, where the Seals are dispensed; there being no place, nor time, nor officers, nor ordinances, appointed, in the New Testament, by Christ the Lord, for any such Assemblies as the Jews had under Moses: it remains, that the Christian Churches whereunto these privileges were given, are *Congregational*; consisting only of so many as may and do meet together ordinarily in one place. . . . Hence it is, that we read so much in the New Testament of ‘the Churches,’ in the plural number. . . . To wind up all, seeing the Churches, in the Gospel, are Congregational, and that Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, being Church privileges, belong only to ‘the Churches,’ it will follow that as city privileges belong only to citizens and their children, so Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, being Church privileges, belong only to the Members of Particular Churches, and their seed: and that seeing *sigillum sequitur donum*, to apply them to others, what is it, but to abuse them?^b . . .

“Secondly; Consider the ordinary Administration of the Seals is limited to the Ministry, and the Ministry to a Particular Church; therefore, the Seals must necessarily be proper to the Church and the Members thereof. That the Administration of the Seals is limited to their Ministry, is evident from the first institution, Matt. xxviii. 19, where God hath joined to *preach*,—namely, by office,—and to *baptize*, together; therefore we may not separate them. For howsoever, any man may, by the appointment of the lord and master of the family, signify his mind and deliver his message from him to the family; yet the dispensing of a fit portion of food to every one of the household, is a

^a “Reply.— . . . Whether this be to keep the bond of the Spirit ‘inviolable,’ namely, to exclude from the Sacrament true visible Believers, or, known recommended Christians formerly Members of ‘visible’ Churches among us, and their children, because they are not Members, as you speak, ‘in Church Order?’ And, whether God alloweth to put this difference between Church-members of your societies and other visible Believers walking in holiness, though not admitted Members of any society according to your ‘Church Order,’ as to receive the one, though Members of another society, unto the Seals, and to debar the other and their children? These are the things to be considered in these present Positions.” . . .

^b “Reply.— . . . The distinct Churches, mentioned in the New Testament, it is not certain that they were congregational societies, ‘consisting only of so many as might and did meet together ordinarily in one place, at one time, for the public worship of God and their own edification.’ And if this were granted, it would not carry the weight that was laid upon it.” . . . [It is not possible, how desirable soever, that room can be afforded for even a quarter of the matter which ten pages quarto, supply upon this consideration alone: nothing but impossibility precludes, therefore, the insertion of what should otherwise appear here. From what is given, the manner of the Replier may be judged of. This intimation will serve for subsequent omissions.]

branch of the steward's office. Indeed the 'keys' are given to the whole Church, yet the exercise and dispensation of them, in this as well as in other particulars, is concredited to the Ministers, who are called to be *οἰκονόμοι μυστηρίων Θεοῦ* 1 Cor. iv. 1. And no Church-office can be orderly performed by any but one that is called thereunto; nor will God vouchsafe his presence and blessing,—whereupon all spiritual efficacy depends,—in an ordinance dispensed, but when it is dispensed by those whom he hath ordained and appointed thereunto. That the Ministry is limited to the Church, appears as from evident texts of Scripture,—Acts xiv. 23; Col. iv. 17; 1 Pet. v. 2; Acts xx. 28,—so, also, upon this ground, The office is founded in the relation between the Church and the Officer; wherefore, take away the relation and the office, and the work ceaseth: for where he hath not power he may not do an act of power; and he hath no power where he hath not a relation by office. Herein the proportion holdeth between an officer of a Town-corporation and of a Church, that as the power of the former is only within his own corporation, so the *power* of the latter is confined to his own congregation.^a

“Consideration the Third: Circumcision and the Passover were to be administered only to the Members of the Church: *ergo*, Baptism and the Lord's Supper are so to be administered also. The consequence is made good by the parity of these ordinances. For, if the argument hold strong, for the proof of Pædobaptism, which is taken from the circumcision of infants; why may we not as well infer a necessity of Church-membership to Baptism, from the necessity of it to Circumcision? And, that Circumcision was peculiar to the Members of the Church, may appear, in that persons circumcised, and only they, might eat the Passover, Exod. xii. 48; and they only might enter into the Temple, Ezek. xlv. 7; which were the privileges of Church-members. . . Circumcision was not administered to all that were under the Covenant of Grace, which all Believers were; but only such of them as joined themselves to the Church; at first, in Abraham's family: whereunto Baptism doth so far answer, that the Apostle counteth these expressly equivalent to be ‘circumcised’ in Christ, ‘with circumcision made with hands;’ and to be ‘buried’ with Christ ‘in baptism,’

^a. “Reply.— . . The first ‘institution’ of Baptism is not contained in that passage, Matt. xxviii. 19, but confirmed. . . That God will not ‘vouchsafe his presence and blessing’ to an ordinance, ‘but when it is dispensed by those whom he hath ordained and appointed thereunto,’ must be warily understood, or it may occasion errors and distractions not a few! . . ‘Feed the flock of God,’ saith Peter; but he speaks of all those dispersed Churches to whom he writes, which he calls ‘a chosen generation, a royal priesthood,’ ‘a peculiar people,’ 1 Pet. ii. 9; and in some respect of reason, under which we may apprehend them one ‘flock,’ but not really as combined under the same pastor, or meeting in one place.” . . [The Replier had overlooked, that Baptism was then “first” instituted to be performed, “In the Name, &c.” He is singularly infelicitous in his comment; which may help to make what we are constrained to omit, the less regretted. Who, on looking at the passages he has adduced, can agree in his interpretation of Peter's words? Chap. v. verse 1, of the First Epistle, contains the words *τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν*. and verse 2, *τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν*. Here Peter has certainly descended from generals to particulars, which limitation is strengthened in verse 3, by the words *τῶν κλήρων*.]

Col. ii. 11, 12. Indeed, in some things, they differ, as only the males were circumcised; whereas, with us, females are also baptized: the reason is, because God hath limited circumcision to the males; but under the Gospel that difference is taken away. Again; circumcision was administered in the private family; but baptism only in the public assemblies of the Church: the reason of this difference is because they were bound to circumcise the males on 'the eighth day;' but that could not stand with going to the Temple, which was too far off, for the purpose, to bring every child thither from all parts of Judea: . . . nor had they always opportunity of a solemn convention in the Synagogue on every 'eighth day,' when some child or other might be to be circumcised. But there is no precise day set down for Baptism, nor are opportunities of public assemblies so remote, where Churches are kept in a Congregational frame, but that every 'first day of the week,' Acts xx. 7, Baptism may be administered if it be required. Again: for the aforesaid reason, Circumcision required not a peculiar Minister, for ought we find in Scripture; but it is not so in Baptism; as was showed in the 'Second Commandment.' But no good reason can be given why, in this, they should not both agree, namely, That they are both to be dispensed only to Members of the visible Church: as it hath been proved, in the 'First Consideration.'^a

"Consideration the Fourth: They that are not capable of the Church Censures, are not capable of the Church Privileges: but they that are not within Church Covenant are not capable of Church Censures; *ergo*, the Proposition is evident. The assumption may be proved, 1 Cor. v. 12. Now to be 'without,' is not only the case of heathen and excommunicants, but of some Believers also, who, though by internal union with Christ they are within the Covenant of Grace, yet being not joined externally to the visible Body of Christ—a Particular Church,—are, in regard of visible Church-communion, said to be 'without.' To this purpose is this text alleged by other divines also.^b ["As Dr. Ames, 'Conscience; with the Power and Cases thereof.' Bk. iv. ch. xxiv. q. 1, a. 5," where, That a Believer is bound "to join himself to some certain Particular Church?" He answers, "Yes, . . . in respect of our profession; because otherwise it cannot be avoided but that those signs will hardly be discerned whereby Believers are distinguished from Unbelievers: 1 Cor. v. 12."]

"Consideration the Fifth: We may add hereunto, . . . the evil and

^a "Reply.—. . . Baptism is not tied to 'the first day of the week;' and the Jews might gather an assembly on the 'eighth day' as occasion required; and it might be appropriate to the Priests and Levites, though done in private. But in whatsoever they agree or differ, we must look to the institution, and neither stretch it wider nor draw it narrower than the Lord hath made it. . . . We must affirm nothing but what God hath taught us; and as he hath taught us!" [The Replier travels out of the bounds, here, as elsewhere, to combat the arguments of the New Englanders, through animadversions on the arguments of other individuals; and so here, p. 40, John Davenport is the party really aimed at, though he had not gone to settle in New England till the year 1637, the same year in which the Letter from "Old England" is dated, and this controversy was thus begun.]

^b "Reply.—. . . In phrase of Scripture, 'heretics' themselves are 'within' the Church; 1 John ii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 19."

pernicious consequences of extending communion in Church-privileges beyond the bounds of Church-fellowship: for thus, first, The extraordinary office of the Apostles, and the ordinary office of Pastors and Teachers, will be much confounded, if the latter be as illimited as the former in the execution of their office, beyond the bounds of their own Particular Churches. Secondly, The distinction of Church Assemblies from the confused multitude is abrogated, if, without membership in a Particular Church, the Parents may communicate with the Churches, in the Lord's Supper; and their Seed, in Baptism. Thirdly, The Church shall endanger the profaning of the Seals; and want one special means whereby the grace and piety of men may be discerned and made known: for if, without respect to their Church-estate, men of 'approved piety,' as you say, are to be admitted to fellowship in the Seals; how shall their 'piety' be 'approved' to the Church? Not by their own report of themselves alone, without attestation of such as are approved by the Church. And, how can such, bear witness to their 'approved piety,' who, against light, refuse to profess subjection to the Gospel of Christ, by orderly joining themselves in fellowship with some approved Church of Christ, as members thereof, when they have opportunity thereunto? seeing such fellowship is an action of piety required of all Believers, in the Second Commandment;—and, true piety frameth men's spirits to have respect to all God's commandments! And we have had much experience of it, That men of 'approved piety' in the judgment of some, have been found too light, not only in the judgment of others, but even of their own consciences, when they have come to the trial in offering themselves to be Members of Churches; with such a blessing hath God followed this order of taking hold of Church-covenant by public profession of faith and repentance, before men be admitted to the Seals. But this means of discovery of men's piety and sincerity, would be utterly lost, if men should be admitted unto the Lord's Table without entering in Church-fellowship.^a

Consideration the Sixth: None have power to dispense the Seals, but they that are called to the office of Ministry: and no man can be so called, till first there be a Church to call him; seeing the power of

^a "Reply.— . . The question is not of all sorts, at random, but of Christians professing the faith entirely; lawfully baptized; known, and approved to the consciences of the wise and judicious visible Members of the Churches of Christ; among us often admitted to the Lord's Table: whether these either sufficiently known unto you, or orderly recommended, may, upon desire and suit, themselves be admitted to communicate in the Lord's Supper, and their children, to be baptized? What fear is there now, that 'the extraordinary office of the Apostles, and the ordinary office of pastors and teachers,' shall be much or little 'confounded?' Is this, to take as 'illimited' power as the Apostles did, 'in the execution of their office?' How shall this tend to abrogate the distinction of Church Assemblies from the confused multitude? Or, how is the profanation of the Seals thereby 'endangered?' . . This we are persuaded, and therefore we speak, that in debarring Christians from the Lord's Supper, and much more the children of those parents who are in covenant with God, from holy Baptism; you exceed your commission you have received from God, and go beyond your due bounds. And, notwithstanding your circumspection, more worthy and faithful Christians have been denied, when [those] of less worth and meaner sufficiencies, have passed, and been by you received."

calling Ministers is given by Christ unto the Church,—‘Demonstration of Discipline,’ chap. iv.—and thence it follows, That all those that desire to partake of the Seals, are bound to join themselves in Church-state, that so they may call a Minister to dispense the Seals unto them. And this duty, by the appointment of God, lieth not only upon some Christians, but equally upon all; *ergo*, no Christian can expect, by the appointment of God, to partake in the Seals, till he have joined himself in Church-fellowship and in the call of the Minister. And, indeed, seeing a Church, and a Minister called by the Church, are of such necessity for the dispensing of the Seals, it may seem unreasonable that some Christians should be bound to become a Church and to call a Minister, that so the Seals may be dispensed, and other men, when this is done, have equal liberty to the Seals, who refuse to join unto the Church!^a

“Consideration the Seventh: That our practice may not be censured as novel and singular, give us leave to produce a precedent of the like case observed and approved by public countenance of State, in the days of Edward VI. of blessed and famous memory, who, in the year 1550, granted Johannes A’Lasco, a learned nobleman of Poland, under the Great Seal of England, liberty to gather a Church of strangers in London, and to order themselves accordingly as they should find to

^a “Reply.—This conclusion is not to the question propounded; for we speak of such as cannot, not such as ‘refuse to join’ themselves unto the Church; or if they do not ‘join,’ it is not out of contempt, or wilful neglect, of God’s ordinance; or desire of carnal liberty, and not to be in subjection to Christ; but for lack of opportunity, or through their fault that should admit them but do not. . . We accuse not the wisdom and discretion of your Churches, but we know the zealous multitude may sometimes be rash. And when reason is craved of your judgment, why you do debar the most known and ‘approved Christians,’ which came over; and their children; from the Seals of the Covenant; we dislike you should put this note upon them, as if ‘against light’ they refused orderly to subject themselves to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. What warrant you have thus to censure; what use of this manner of dispute; we leave it to your godly wisdom to judge! . . A company of men converted to the faith, being unbaptized may, and ought to desire Baptism; but they have not power to elect and choose one among themselves to dispense the Seals unto the rest, for ought is to be found in Scripture. . . It can never be showed in Scripture, that any society of unbaptized persons did first choose from among them a Pastor or Teacher by whom they might be baptized. You cannot produce one example, or other proof, in the Scripture, of one man teaching the Gospel ministerially, but he was baptized, and a Member of a true Church; or, of a society who made choice of a Pastor and Teacher, but they were baptized persons! . . A wrong it is, altogether to debar the godly of their consent in the ‘calling’ of such as must ‘watch for their souls; but it makes not the calling itself a mere nullity: for then, many Churches in the world, within a few hundred years after Christ, should have wanted both ministry and sacraments. . . If a company of Infidels should be converted to the faith, they must desire to partake in the Ordinances of Grace before they could join together in a Churchway to call a Minister of their own, who might administer the Sacraments unto them. . . If Infidels be converted to the faith, must they not partake in the Seals, because they cannot join ‘in Church-fellowship and call of the Minister,’ before they be admitted to Baptism? . . If a people be joined together in Church-fellowship, and have called a Pastor to feed and watch over them, we desire—not words, but—proof, why the poor dispersed Christians wanting means or opportunity to join themselves together into society, ought not to desire, and that others be not bound in conscience to afford them, the comfort of God’s ordinances? . . ”

be most agreeable to the Scriptures.^a Among other Godly Orders established in that Church, that which concerneth the Administration of Baptism, to prevent the profanation of it, we will repeat in A'Lasco's own words. 'Baptism in our Church,' saith he, 'is administered in the public assembly of the Church, after the public Sermon: for seeing Baptism doth so belong to the whole Church, that none ought to be driven thence who is a Member of the Church, nor to be admitted to it who is not a Member of it; truly it is equal that that should be performed publicly in the assembly of the whole Church, which belongs to the whole Church in common:' again, he addeth, 'Now, seeing our Churches are, by God's blessing, so established by the King's Majesty, that they may be, as it were, one parish of strangers dispersed throughout the whole city, or one body-corporate,—as it is called in the King's grant,—and yet all strangers do not join themselves to our Church; yea, there are those who, while they avoid all Churches, will pretend to the English Churches that they are joined with us; and to us, that they are joined to the English Churches! And so do abuse both them and us. Lest the English Churches and the Ministers thereof should be deceived by the impostures of such men; and that, under colour of our Churches, we do baptize their infants alone who have joined themselves to our Churches by public confession of their faith and observation of ecclesiastical discipline. And that our Churches may be certain that the Infants that are to be baptized are their seed who have joined themselves thereto, in manner aforesaid, the father of the infant to be baptized, if possibly he can,—or other men and women of notable credit in the Church, do offer the Infant to

^a They consisted of German Refugees from the troubles occasioned by the edict called the 'Interim.' By A'Lasco's intercession the Church in Austin-Friars, formerly a Priory, was granted them, with its revenues, and his office likewise extended over all the other foreign Reformed Churches in London; French, Spanish, Italian, &c. Having been requested by the pious and tolerant King, Edward VI., to write on some of the matters then disputed, he oppugned the Ritual, the Ecclesiastical Habits, and the Gesture of Kneeling at the Communion Table: "*Brevis et Dilucida de Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi Tractatio; in qua fons ipse et ratio totius Sacramentariæ Nostri Temporis Controversiæ, paucis exponitur. 1552.*" 8vo. After Mary's accession these foreigners left the kingdom; but were reinstated on Elizabeth's accession, in 1558. With what jealousy they were watched by Episcopalians is apparent from the "*judicious*" Richard Hooker's words, where he writes, "When Germany had stricken off that which appeared corrupt in the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, but seemed nevertheless in Discipline still to retain therewith very great conformity; France, by that rule of policy which hath been before mentioned, took away the Popish Orders which Germany did retain. But process of time hath brought more light unto the world; whereby men perceiving that they of the Religion in France have also retained some Orders which were before in the Church of Rome, and are not commanded in the Word of God; there hath arisen a sect in England, which following still the very self-same rule of policy, seeketh to reform even the French Reformation, and purge out from thence also dregs of Popery. These have not taken as yet such root that they are able to establish anything. But if they had, what would spring out of their stock, and how far the unquiet wit of man might be carried—with rules of such policy, God doth know. The trial which we have lived to see, may somewhat teach us what posterity is to fear." *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. iv. sect. 8, with the note. Vol. i. p. 288, edit. Hanbury, 1830. How Laud acted with regard to these Foreign Churches, may be seen in his *Life* by Heylyn, pt. ii. lib. iv. *ann.* 1634.

Baptism, and do publicly profess that it is the seed of the Church : yet we suffer no stranger to offer infants in Baptism, in our Churches, who hath not made public profession of his faith, and willingly submitted himself to the discipline of the Church, lest otherwise they who present their children to Baptism might, in time, plead that they belong to our Churches ; and so should deceive the English Churches and their Ministers.' To those which presented Infants to Baptism, they propounded three questions : the first was, ' Are these Infants which you offer, the seed of *this* Church, that they may *lawfully* be here baptized by our Ministry ?' This instance is the more to be regarded, because A'Lasco affirmeth, in the Preface of that Book, that this liberty was by the King granted to them, out of his desire to settle a like reformation in the English Churches ; which, in effect, you see is the same with our practice in this particular." ^a

" Fifth Position : ' That the Power of Excommunication is so in the body of the Church that what the Major Part shall allow [that] must be done, though the Pastors and Governors and the rest of the Assembly be of another mind, and that, peradventure, upon more substantial reasons.'

" Ans.—If the question had been, Whether the Power of Excommunication lies in the Body of the Congregation, consisting of Officers and Members ; our Answer should be affirmative, and according hereunto is also our practice ; and we hope your judgment and ours are not different herein : but, seeing the question is, Whether it is ' so in

^a " Reply.—The 'practice' of the Church of Strangers in London, received by John A'Lasco, is far different from your judgment and practice ; not in some by-circumstances, but in the main point in question : for [first] your judgment is that true visible Believers,—baptized and partakers of the Lord's Supper in other Churches not yet gathered into Church-estate or fellowship,—have no right or interest in the Seals ; they, nor their seed. But this Church of Strangers held no such opinion ; as their own words, which you have omitted, do plainly speak. ' And Paul testifieth,' say they, ' that by Christ's Ordinance, the Church itself, without exception of any Member of it, is to be accounted clean or holy by the ministry of Baptism.' [Qy. ? Eph. v. 25—27.] Whence we may easily see that Baptism doth neither belong to those who are altogether without the Church, nor to be denied to any Member of the Church. Secondly ; They held communion with the Church of England as one and the same with theirs : for so they profess, ' Yet nevertheless, that we may openly show that the English Churches and ours are one and the same Church, though we differ somewhat from them both in language and ceremonies ; we do not refuse that the English may as public Witnesses of the Church, offer the Infants of our *Members* [!] to Baptism in our Churches, if they have both the use of our language and a certain testimony of their piety. As, in like manner, our Members are accustomed to offer the Infants of the English to Baptism in the English Church.' If your judgment be this, of the English Churches ; your judgment in acknowledging us Members of true Churches, and 'practice' in debarring visible Believers and their seed from the Seals, are opposite the one to the other. Thirdly ; This order was observed by them to prevent 'the impostures' of some who, ' whilst they avoid all Churches,' *pretend* to the English, that they are 'joined' to the Strangers ; and to the Strangers, that they are 'joined' to the English. But you debar *known* Christians, who desire to join themselves with you ; not to prevent 'impostures' of them who avoid all Churches.' Yea, you debar them as men having no right to the Sacraments, because they be not in Church-fellowship ! And herein you can show no precedent, ancient or modern, either from Scripture, or Monuments of the Church." . . . [From this point, we pass over several pages and cannot, even though we would, quote from the remaining sections headed "Reply."]

the Body of the *Congregation*, that what the major part doth allow, &c.' our Answer is negative, namely, That the Power of Excommunication is *not* seated in the Congregation, neither ought it to be so in any of the Churches of the Lord Jesus; who ought not to carry matters, by number of votes, against God, as this 'Position' implieth; but, by strength of rule and reason, according to God. The Power of the Apostles was not to do things 'against the truth, but for the truth,' 2 Cor. xiii. 8; and 'not for destruction,' but for 'edification,' 2 Cor. x. 8. And the same may be said concerning the Power which God hath given to the Church; and if any Church among us have swerved from the rule,—which is more than we know,—we do not allow them in such a practice, but should be ready, as the Lord should help, to convince them of their sin therein.

"Sixth Position: 'That none are to be admitted, as [Set] Members, but they must promise not to depart or remove, unless the congregation will give leave.'

"Ans.—Our answer hereto is, briefly, this. We judge it expedient, and most according to Rule, that such Brethren as are in covenant with the Church, and ours as fellow-members, and have committed their souls to our charge as Ministers; should not forsake our Fellowship, nor abruptly break away from us when and whither they please: but first approve themselves therein to their Brethren's consciences, and take their counsel in so weighty a matter. For which we propound, to consider these two reasons [or grounds] following. The former is drawn from the nature of the Church-covenant, which consists in these four particulars: First, Every Member, at his admission, doth openly profess, and solemnly promise, that, by Christ's help assisting, he will not only, in general, give up himself,—as to the Lord, to be guided by him, so—to the Church, according to God to be directed by it: which is no more than the Members of the Church of Macedonia did, in a parallel case;^a but, also, in particular, that he will perform all duties of brotherly love and faithfulness to all the members of the body; as, of diligent watchfulness over all his brethren, thereby to prevent sin; so, of faithful admonition after their falls, to regain them to the Lord from their sin: the former being enjoined, Heb. iii. 13: and the want thereof deeply condemned in Cain, that would not acknowledge that duty of being his 'brother's keeper';^b the latter, given in charge to the Church-members of Israel, by the hand of Moses,^c and so by Christ himself;^d and by Paul also.^e Secondly; The engagements are not made only by the Members admitted into the Church, but by the Church back again to the Members. So that thereby the whole Church in general, and every Member thereof in particular, stand as well, in conscience, bound to perform all duties of love and watchfulness to him as he doth to them: and this we do according to the golden rule of love and equity, enjoined by our Saviour;^f fearing that contrary practice of Scribes and Pharisees, so much condemned by Christ, of laying greater 'burdens' upon others than we ourselves are willing to undergo.^g Thirdly; These Promises, thus lawfully and mutually made, that

^a 2 Cor. viii. 5.^b Gen. iv. 9.^c Levit. xix. 17.^d Matt. xxviii. 15.^e Gal. vi. 1, 2.^f Matt. vii. 12.^g Matt. xxiii. 4.

Members, as also the whole Church, are bound, not only every one for himself, actively to perform them, but passively also to suffer his brethren to do those offices upon and towards himself. If he neglect the former, he shall falsify his covenant so solemnly, before God, and angels and men, made; and so not only break his promise to his brother, contrary to Psalm xv. 4, but also, in some sort, commit the sin of Ananias and Sapphira, in lying against 'the Holy Ghost,' condemned and punished severely by God's own hand.^a If he fail in the latter, he shall not only be guilty of the same sin of breach of covenant with God, and man, as in the former, but shall also be guilty of this folly of despising 'counsel,' so much condemned;^b and shall also proclaim this his folly and pride, by showing to all the Church that he is 'wise' in his 'own eyes,' and leans to his 'own wisdom;' both reproved, Prov. iii. 7; xxiii. 4. . . Fourthly; From all these things premised, it appears that we can do no less,—and yet we do no more,—than, first, require a Member, before he depart, according to our covenant thus lawfully, deliberately, and mutually made, to express to his Brethren his desire of departing, and the place and society to which he tends; whether to a godly Church, where he may be edified; or to some corrupt Assembly, where he may be destroyed! And, secondly, [require] his grounds and reasons which move him so to do: which, if they hold good, being scanned by the Word, he may be not only confirmed in his way by the consent and advice of many; but counselled also, how to manage his departure for his best comfort. And so, after all, solemnly with the whole Church's prayers and blessings, in the name of Christ, dismissed. But if his grounds either be none at all, or weak and sinful; and that his desire of departing savours of self-will, inordinate love of gain, rash precipitancy, or a spirit of schism, more strongly than of sound reason; then, what can we do less, without breach of covenant, than in love and tenderness, show him his weakness, dissuade him from his purpose, and refuse to consent? Yet if, after all this, we see his spirit stedfastly and stiffly bent for a departure; then, though we dare not act against our light, by consenting or counselling, yet if his sin be not apparent, and danger imminent, we use rather,—through indulgence in cases of like nature,—to suspend our vote against him; as not willing, against his will, to detain him: abhorring to make our Churches places of restraint and imprisonment! But if any should object that this argument holds firm where this Church-covenant is allowed to be lawful—but with some it is questioned, and with them it avails not—we answer, first, Some indeed have questioned the necessity of our Church-covenant, but none, we hope, of these our Reverend Brethren, that we write unto, do question the lawfulness of such a covenant; being nothing else, for the matter of it, but a promise of doing such Christian duties as the Gospel of Christ requires of all Saints in Church-estate: for we do not herein promise to perform any new duty to our brethren, which was not before commanded us of the Lord, but only revive and renew our purposes afresh of performing such duties unto that particular body, into which we are

^a Acts v. 3, 5, 10.

^b Prov. xii. 15; and i. 7.

then incorporated, as were before enjoined in the Word; as to 'love' each other,^a and to watch over each other out of love for their good; to be ready to give counsel and to take counsel from each other; to prevent sin in them, or to gain them from sin;^b all which, are plentifully and frequently held forth in the Scriptures. For the defect of which care and watchfulness all the Body shall be wrapt in the same guilt and punishment with the Member that commits the sin; as the whole Church of Israel was, in Achan's sin and punishment. Secondly; It is a thing very reasonable, and a known fundamental rule in all societies, that he that is incorporate thereto, and so participates of the privileges thereof, should engage himself to conform to all such lawful rites and orders as are expedient for the well-being of that society; the contrary whereto will be a thing injurious in him to offer, and confusion to themselves to accept.

"The second ground, is drawn from the necessity that may fall upon the Body if every particular Member should depart at his own pleasure. For as every society, so much more a Church of Saints, both from principles of nature and Christianity also, not only lawfully may, but, in duty, are bound to endeavour the preservation of itself, and, *ergo*, timely to foresee, and wisely to prevent, all such things as would bring destruction to itself. Now, if any Member might, when, whither, and wherefore he please, without consent of the Church, depart away from it; this may, by unavoidable consequence, dissipate the whole. For if one man may so depart, why may not another also, though never so useful in that Body; and whose absence might much shake the well-being of it? And if one, why not two, six, ten, twenty, as well? For where will ye stop, seeing any may plead the same liberty; and if Members may so do, why not the Pastor and Teacher also; seeing they are tied to him by the same relation that he is to them? And so the principals falling, the whole building must down! And if this may be so in one Church, why not in all? And so, Christ should have no settled Church on earth.

"Seventh Position: 'That a Minister is so a Minister of a Particular Congregation, that if they dislike him unjustly, or leave him, he ceaseth to be their Minister.'

"Ans.—Our answer to this, consists in two branches: first, In case a Minister be set aside by the Church, merely through his default: secondly, By the Church's default, without any desert of his. In the former case, it is evident he ceaseth to be a Minister to them any longer; as appears in four conclusions. First, It is clear from the Word, that a Pastor or Teacher in these days, hath no Apostolical power over all Churches; but only limited to that one Church where God hath set him. Paul gives not the Elders at Ephesus a general commission to teach all Churches, but to go feed that one 'Flock' over which 'the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers.'^c So Peter gives direction to Elders to feed that 'Flock of God' only which was among them, and

^a Heb. xiii. 1.

^b Prov. xii. 19; i. 7, 23. Gen. iv. 4. 9. Lev. xix. 17. Matt. xviii. 15. Gal. vi. 1.

^c Acts xx. 28.

take 'the oversight thereof.'^a Secondly, It is as clear, that all this Power of Feeding which the Minister hath in that Church, is, nextly, derived to him from Christ by the Church, who hath solemnly called him to the work, and promised to obey him therein: for, if he have it elsewhere, it must be either from Christ immediately, or from some other men deputed, by Christ, to confer it on him; or, he must take it up himself. Not the first, for that was proper to the Apostles, or Apostolical men; therefore Paul, proving his Apostleship, saith he was called 'not of men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ' himself:^b not the second, for we never read in God's Word that any ordinary officers, or other besides the Church, had any commission given them from Christ, to call Ministers unto Churches: not the third, for 'no man taketh this honour,' namely, of a Priest under the Law, or of a Minister under the Gospel, 'but he that is called of God:'^c therefore, it must needs be from Christ, by the Church! Thirdly, As the Church, in the Name of Christ, gave this power to a Minister to be what he is, and do what he doth amongst them; when such a Minister shall make and manifest himself apparently unworthy and unfit to discharge the place which they thus called him unto, so that they may discern that Christ, the Head of the Church, hath refused him from being a Minister unto Him, they may then, upon as good grounds, depose him from it, as they had called him to it. Fourthly, When a Church hath thus, in Christ's Name, put forth this power of shutting, as before it did of opening, to a Minister, then, he must cease to be a Minister unto them any more: for we know no such 'indelible character' imprinted^d upon a Minister, [but] that the Ministry ceasing, the Minister ceaseth also.

"Secondly; In case the Church shall, without cause, or sufficient weighty cause, rashly or wilfully set aside whom Christ hath set over them, and whom they so solemnly called, and promised, before the Lord, to submit unto; and so abuse their power given them by Christ; it is, doubtless, a very great wrong unto the Minister, and sin against Christ himself, before whom it was done: and not only Christ himself will take it ill at their hands for such contempt done to Him in his Ministers, according to Christ's speech, 'He that *rejecteth* you *rejecteth* me';^e and God's speech, 'They have not cast off thee but me';^f but even other Churches, also may admonish them, and if they prove obstinate therein, withdraw the right hand of fellowship from them. And concerning the Minister himself thus deposed, seeing it is done not by Christ, but by the Church without Christ, yea against the mind of Christ, we conceive though he be by them deprived of the execution of his Ministry among them, yet, until he accepts of a call to another people, he doth yet still remain a Minister of Christ; in whose account, notwithstanding such deposition, he hath true right of administration among that people.

"Eighth Position: 'That one Minister cannot perform any Ministerial act in another Congregation.'

"Ans.—If you take 'ministerial act' improperly, as sometimes it

^a 1 Pet. v. 2.

^b Gal. i. 1.

^c Heb. v. 4.

^d "There is a character imprinted by the Bishop's Ordination." Concil. Trident. Sess. xxiii. can. 4.

^e Luke x. 16.

^f 1 Sam. viii. 7.

is taken by some, only when the Minister of one Church doth exercise his gifts of praying and preaching in another Church, being, by themselves, so desired; then, we answer, In this sense a Minister of one Church may do a 'ministerial act' in another; which he doth not 'perform' by virtue of any calling, but only by his gifts: and thus, upon any occasion, we mutually 'perform' those acts one in another's Churches. But, if you mean by 'ministerial act' such an 'act' of authority and power in dispensing of God's Ordinance as a Minister doth 'perform' to the Church whereunto he is called to be a Minister; then, we deny that he can so 'perform any ministerial act' to any other Church but his own; because his office extends no further than his call! For that solemn charge, Acts xx. 28, is not to feed all flocks, but that one 'Flock' only 'over which the Holy Ghost' hath made them 'overseers.' If the question were propounded, to any Minister so exercising in another's Church, which was once, to our Saviour by the chief Priests and Elders, 'By what power doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?'^a let that Minister, whosoever he be, study how to make an answer!"

"Ninth Position: 'That Members of one Congregation may not Communicate in another.'"

To this, there is no "Answer" and so no "Reply;" the subject being merged in the former Positions. We pass entirely over the "Letter" accompanying the "Reply," because it is, in substance, a repetition of what is in the Reply itself.^b

CHAP. XXXVI.

LAUD'S EXILES.—LILBURNE.—ABBOT.—BALL.—LAUD'S CANONS.—
RETURN OF HIS VICTIMS, BURTON, ETC.

UNDER the year 1638, Heylyn writes of the "little trouble" which could then "be feared from Lecturers, as they now were regulated." Many had "deserted their stations because they would not read the Common Prayer in their hoods and surplices;" others, called "Combination-Lecturers" read the service now here, now there, under strict subjection to their superiors; which being to be done also in the canonical habits, "kept off the greatest part of the rigid Calvinists from exercising their gifts as formerly, in the great market-towns."^c What other effects ensued upon the enforcement of this regulation, cannot be shown on less questionable testimony, in such a case, than Heylyn's own, where, referring to an instance of "Rules of Polity" being resorted

^a Matt. xxi. 23.

^b The Controversy is revived hereafter; by J. Allin and T. Shepard.

^c Life of Laud, p. 364, 365.

to by "condescension," to keep "many men at home with their wives and families," who "otherwise were upon a resolution of departing the kingdom:"—

"For so it was," he continues, "that the people, in many great trading towns which were near the sea, having been long discharged of the bond of ceremonies, no sooner came to hear the least noise of a 'Conformity,' but they began to spurn against it. And when they found that all their striving was in vain, that they had lost the comfort of the Lectures, and that their Ministers began to shrink at the very name of a Visitation; it was no hard matter for those Ministers and Lecturers to persuade them to remove their dwellings and transport their trades. 'The Sun of Heaven,' say they, 'doth shine as comfortably in other places; the Sun of Righteousness^a much brighter!'—'Better to go and dwell in Goshen,^b find it where we can, than tarry in the midst of such an Egyptian darkness as is now falling on this land!'—'The sinful corruptions of the Church,' said they, 'are now grown so general, that there is no place free from that contagion, and infections of it; and, therefore, 'Go out of her my people, and be not partakers of her sins!'^c And hereunto they were the more easily persuaded, by seeing so many Dutchmen with their wives and children to forsake the kingdom; who, having got wealth enough in England, chose rather to go back to their native countries than to be obliged to resort to their Parish Churches, as, by the Archbishop's Injunctions, they were bound to do. Amongst the first which separated, upon this account, were [T.] Goodwin, Nye, Burroughes, Bridge, and Simpson; who, taking some of their followers with them, betook themselves to Holland as their 'city of Refuge!' There they filled up their congregations to so great a number, that it was thought fit to be divided; Goodwin and Nye retiring unto Arnheim, a town of Guelderland; Simpson and Bridge fixing at Rotterdam, in Holland; but what became of Burroughes, I am yet to seek.^d These men, affecting neither the severe discipline of Presbytery, nor the licentiousness incident to 'Brownism,' embraced Robinson's model of Church-government in their congregations, consisting of a co-ordination of several Churches for their mutual comfort; not a subordination of the one to the other, in the way of direction or command. Hence came the name of 'Independents,' continued unto those amongst us who neither associate themselves with the Presbyterians, nor embrace the frenzies of the Anabaptists. . . The courteous entertainment which these people found in the Belgic Provinces, might easily have served for a strong temptation to bring over the rest, to enjoy the like; but the country was too narrow for them, and the Brethren of the Separation desired elbow-room, for fear of *interfering* with one another. New England was chiefly in their eye, a Puritan plantation from the beginning, and therefore fitter for the growth of the Zuinglian or Calvinian gospel than any country whatsoever. . . The principal bell-wethers of these flocks were Cotton, Chauncey, Wells, [Thomas] Hooker, and perhaps Hugh

^a Mal. iv. 2.

^b Gen. xlv. 10.

^c Rev. xviii. 4.

^d He was at Rotterdam also.

Peters: the rest, let them look after, who affect such company!^a . . . It was once under consultation of the Chief Physicians who were to take especial care of the Church's [of England's] health, to send a

^a We give the following as a sample of the usage to which those who were compelled to abandon their country were subjected; from the "Rump: or, An exact Collection of the Choicest Poems and Songs relating to the late times.—By the most eminent Wits, from *anno* 1639, to *anno* 1661. 1662." 12mo. 2 parts, pp. 576. p. 1.

"THE ZEALOUS PURITAN. 1639.

- " My Brethren all, attend ye!
 And list to my relation;
 This is the day,—mark what I say,
 Tends to your renovation.
 Stay not among the wicked,
 Lest that here, with them, you perish;
 But let us to—New-England go,
 And the Pagan people cherish.
 Then for the Truth's sake, come along; come along;
 Leave this place of superstition:
 Wer't not for *we*—that Brethren be,
 You would sink into perdition!
- " There you may teach our hymns too,
 Without the law's controlment;
 We need not fear—the Bishops there,
 Nor sp'ritual-courts' enrolment:
 The surplice shall not fright us,
 Nay, nor superstitious blindness;
 Nor scandals rise—when we disguise,
 And our sisters kiss in kindness.
 Then for the Truth's sake, &c.
- " For company, I fear not;
 There goes my cousin Hannah,
 And Reuben so—persuades to go
 My cousin Joyce, Susanna,
 With Abigail and Faithful;
 And Ruth, no doubt will come after;
 And Sarah kind—wo'nt stay behind,
 My own cousin Constance' daughter.
 Then for the Truth's sake, &c.
- " Tom' tyler, is prepared;
 The smith, as black as a coal;
 Ralph' cobbler too—with us will go,
 For he doth regard his *soul*;
 The weaver, honest Simon,
 With good Prudence, JACOB's daughter,
 And Sarah, she;—and Barbary,
 Who professeth to come after.
 Then for the Truth's sake, &c.
- " When we, that are elected,
 Arrive in that fair country,
 E'en by our faith,—as Brethren *saith*,
 We will not fear our entry:
 The psalms shall be our music;
 Our time be spent in expounding,
 Which, in our zeal,—we will reveal
 To the Brethren's joy abounding!
 Then for the Truth's sake, &c."

Bishop over to them, for their better government; and to back him with some forces, to compel, if he were not otherwise able to persuade, obedience: but this design was strangled in the first conception, by the violent breaking out of the troubles in Scotland."^a

One of these singular characters, concerning whom it is remarked that "it was found difficult, to check the spirits of men who placed both their honour and their conscience in suffering,"^b requires our attention, at this place. Lilburne stands forth as the offspring of disordered times. From his youth upward he was ardent, acute, and intractable; and has acquired the reputation of being "the most turbulent, but the most upright and courageous of human kind!"^c a description emanating from a pen not accustomed to overflow with excessive ingenuousness. He opposed, in his own person, the entire mass of authority exercised by Ecclesiastics; and resisted what he deemed the excesses of secular power, by whom and whensoever they were employed. We shall confine ourselves to the only one out of a surprising number of publications under his name, which bears on its front any direct applicability to our own design; our memorial of him will, therefore, be concise in quantity, but ample enough to exhibit the kind of spirit which reigned within him; for we have neither the disposition nor the opportunity here to examine and set down such palliations as his own excesses may seem to need; we remark only, that the pains and penalties inflicted on him did not proceed, especially at first, from judges in whose breasts mercy was a darling attribute.

"'Come out of her, my people:' or, An Answer to the Questions of a Gentlewoman,—a Professor in the Antichristian Church of England,—about Hearing the Public Ministers: Where it is largely discussed and proved to be sinful and unlawful. Also, a Just Apology for the Way of Total Separation;—commonly, but falsely, called 'Brownism,'—That it is the Truth of God, though lightly esteemed in the eyes of the world. With a Challenge to dispute with them publicly before King and Council, to prove whatsoever I said, at the pillory, against them: viz., That the calling of them is *jure Diabolo*; even from the Devil himself.^d By me, John Lilburne, close Prisoner in the

^a Life of Laud, p. 366—368.—"July, 1637, the 23rd day, there was great disturbance in Edinburgh, about a new Service-book endeavoured to be obtruded on the Scots by the King and Canterbury. . . It admitted unto the people, as I remember, the Communion but in one kind! . . In May, or April [1638], new tumults arose; and truly I may almost say that that corrupt Common-Prayer-Book was the sole and whole occasion of all the miseries and wars that since have happened in both nations. Had his Majesty first endeavoured the imposition of that lame book upon the English, most men did believe we had swallowed it, and then the Scots must have done it afterwards; for the clergy, at that time, generally were such idle and lazy lubbers, and so pampered with court-preferment, and places temporal in every shire in England, and such flattering sycophants, that, doubtless, the great hand of God was in it, that those rude Scots first broke the ice, and taught us the way to expel an insulting priesthood, and to resist the King, he endeavouring by unwarrantable means, to intrude things contrary to the Divine law of Almighty God, upon our consciences." Lilly, p. 207, 208; *ubi sup.* vol. i. p. 554.

^b Hume, Hist. chap. lii. an. 1637.

^c *Ibid.* chap. lx. an. 1651.

^d "A Work of the Beast; or, a Relation of a most Unchristian Censure executed upon John Lilburne,—Now Prisoner in the Fleet,—the 18th of April,

Fleet, for the cause of Christ.—‘My sheep hear my voice;’—‘for they know not the voice of strangers.’ John x. 27, 5.—Printed in the year of hope of England’s Purgation, and the Prelates’ Dissolution. Anno 1639.” 4to. pp. 35.

With such a preliminary, this subsequent strain is but consistent: “But now for my judgment. For my own part, if I should never hear a sermon while I live, yet I should never dare to hear one from any man, good or bad, that is made a Minister by the Prelates, or any of their creatures, or by virtue of any of their muddy Antichristian laws; neither dare I have any spiritual communion with them, so long as they stand in their calling, in regard I am persuaded that he that heareth them sinneth, having no warrant out of the Book of God to do it. And, by necessary consequence, I will prove it, That whosoever hears them, so long as they officiate by virtue of their calling and power which they have received from the Bishops, to preach, doth hear the devil: for the Holy Ghost saith, the subjects of the kingdom of the Beast, ‘worshipped the Dragon,’—that is to say, the devil,—‘which gave power unto the Beast; and they worshipped the Beast, saying, Who is like to the Beast? who is able to war with the Beast?’^a Now let us not think that they did fall down to the devil himself, and do homage to him, face to face; for we never read of any that did this: but the Holy Ghost doth here declare, That all those that stoop or yield, in the least, to the laws of the Beast, do worship and serve the devil, from whom he hath received his power.”^b

In accordance with what has been produced, and with what is contained in the tract itself, Lilburne states his challenge; “I will, if you please, dispute with you all, face to face, before the King and State, for life and liberty; upon the ensuing propositions. First, To prove that the Pope’s power, is from the Devil. Secondly, That your calling, power, authority, and jurisdiction, are from the Pope. Thirdly, That

1638. With the Heavenly Speech uttered by him at the time of his suffering. Very useful for these times, both for the encouragement of the Godly to suffer, and for the terror and shame of the Lord’s adversaries.—Heb. x. 36; xi. 36.—Printed in the year the Beast was wounded: 1638.” 4to. pp. 32. “The Publisher,” F. R., writes, “To speak what I think, my mind gives me that the Lord is now upon extinguishing the bloody Prelates out of our land. For whereas they have not, in some late years, showed the cruelty which they did before, but now increase in persecution; methinks this is a clear foregoing sign that—like a snuff in the socket—their end and ruin are at hand.” In p. 20, Lilburne is represented to have said, “I am the son of a gentleman, and my friends are of rank and quality in the country where they live, which is two hundred miles from this place; and I am, in my present condition, deserted of them all, for I know not one of them [that] dare meddle with me in my present estate, being I am stung by the Scorpions—the Prelates! And, for anything I know, it may be I shall never have a favourable countenance from any of them again; and withal, I am a young man, and likely to have lived well and in plenty, according to the fashion of the world; yet notwithstanding, for the Cause of Christ, and to do Him service, I have and do bid adieu to father, friends, riches, pleasures, ease, contented life; . . . and lay all down at the footstool of Jesus Christ. . . . And I am so far from thinking my affliction and punishment which this day I have endured, and still do endure and groan under, a disgrace, that I receive it as the welcome Cross of Christ, and do think myself this day more honoured by my sufferings than if a crown of gold had been set upon my head.”

^a Rev. xiii. 4.

^b P. 8.

all God's people are bound, under pain of eternal damnation, to withdraw from spiritual obedience and subjection from your spiritual law and kingdom.

"Now upon these propositions, will I dispute with you all, and venture life for life, before the King and State, upon these terms: First, That you shall lay aside club-arguments, which are, 'Take him, jailor, and lay him in irons;' and 'lock him up close prisoner;' and, 'keep him in safe custody!' Secondly, That the Book of God, which is an infallible Truth, shall be the sole judge of the controversy. Thirdly, That I may have liberty, without being gagged, to speak my mind freely and boldly. Fourthly, That I may have the use of some books which I shall choose. . . Also, be it known unto you, that I will, at Paul's Cross, dispute with all your Priests and Deacons, upon these propositions: First, That they are all of them servants and ministers of Antichrist. Secondly, That in the place and standing they are now in, at this present, they have no authority from God, to preach his Word, nor administer any of his sacred ordinances to the people; nor the people any ground or warrant out of the Word of God, to hear the Word from, or partake with them. Thirdly, That the Church of England, as at this day it stands, is Antichristian in power, in matter, in ministry, in form, and in worship. Fifthly, That all God's people are bound in duty and conscience, to separate away from it, and to have no communion with it."^a

So wrote Lilburne; be it, however, not forgotten, that to him the present generation are, perhaps, unconscious debtors for what is, from the year 1792, the Statute Law of Libel;^b but which was in his case first claimed, if not declared, to be the common law of the land. He was tried for transgressing the new Statute of Treasons, enacted by the Commonwealth, but acquitted. When the verdict was pronounced Westminster Hall resounded with acclamations; and a medal was struck, to perpetuate the victory; the obverse bears his head, with this inscription, "John Lilburne, saved by the power of the Lord, and the integrity of his Jury, *who are judges of law as well as fact*, October 26, 1649." On the reverse, are the twelve names of the Jury.^c

To assist in gaining as full an insight as may be into the whole state of the controversy between those who asserted, as some even yet assert, and those who disallowed, as their successors disallow, a predominance to belong of right, because inherent, as is alleged and self-perpetuated through a class appertaining to but an insignificant few compared with the multitude of implied subordinates, the two treatises annexed hereto are advantageous. The first, bears the title of "The Trial of our Church-Forsakes: or, A Meditation tending to still the Passions of unquiet 'Brownists;' upon Heb. x. 25. Wherein is justified, against them, 1. That the Blessed Church of England is a True Church; 2. hath a True Ministry; 3. hath a True Worship.—By Robert Abbot, Vicar of Cranbrook, in Kent. 1639." 16mo. pp. 249.^d

^a P. 34, 35.

^b 32nd Geo. III. cap. lx.

^c Evelyn's Numismata, 1697. Fol. 171. No. 93. In fo. 170, Evelyn writes, "Whose medal is a Record."

^d A brother of Archbishop Abbot, named Robert, who died in 1618, "was

In the Epistle to his Parishioners, he imputes to the "Brownists" that they "pretend to two things; to the Scriptures, and to Conscience;" and he goes on to say, "I know a third thing in them, Weakness!" Further, he says, "And because they are weak, I have not showed myself a man, in giving them any bitter language, or exasperating terms. . . . Indeed I have taken their affected name out of their mouths—'Separatists,'—and given their right one unto them, 'Brownists:' and this I have done out of conscience. I find, by experience, that the word 'Separation' doth win to their cause; for, when people of strong affections and weaker judgments do read of the necessity of *separation*, in the Scriptures, and cannot discern how we have made *separation* from Heathenism; and when we [who] have been thrust out of Rome,—because we were unwilling to be so bad as she,—have maintained our just standing from her, in a divided way, they have been willing to hearken to a *separating* plot. Therefore Browne being the leader amongst us, to this breach,—if now time hath not made it worse than he intended it,—I cannot nick-name, but in conscience call the child after the father's name. It was Christ's course, 'Ye are of your father the devil,'^a his 'children'^b ye are; and so must I. It is true also, that afterwards, ye may find some opinions gone against that are held by some that keep communion with our Church as of a true Church. But I am sure they are the 'Brownists' opinions also, to whom I speak."

strongly affected towards the Puritans, as appears from some of his works, particularly his Sermon on the 110th Psalm, 1601; his 'Antichristi Demonstratio,' 1603; and his 'Treatise against Bishops.' . . . Being Vice-Chancellor that year [1614] he preached a sermon, . . . in which he made allusions to Laud, which were at once understood. Laud, then President of St. John's, was not present on this occasion, but he was persuaded . . . to attend at St. Mary's Church on the following Sunday, when the sermon, according to ancient custom, was again to be delivered. He complied, and heard Dr. Abbot abuse him for nearly an hour from the pulpit, and in such an undisguised manner, that he was actually pointed at by the auditors. . . . 'Some,' said Dr. Abbot, 'are partly Romish, partly English, as occasion serves them, that a man might say unto them, noster es, an adversarium? who, under pretence of truth, and preaching against the Puritans, strike at the heart and root of the religion now established among us. They cannot plead that they are accounted Papists because they speak against the Puritans, but because, being indeed Papists, they speak nothing against them. If they do at any time speak against the Papists, they do but beat a little about the bush, and that but softly too, for fear of waking and disquieting the birds that are in it.' . . . After defending Presbytery for a considerable time, he then exclaimed 'Might not Christ say, What art thou? Romish or English? Papist or Protestant? Or, what art thou? A mongrel compound of both; a Protestant by ordination, a Papist in point of free-will, inherent righteousness, and the like. A Protestant in receiving the sacrament, a Papist in the doctrine of the sacrament. What? Do you think there are two heavens? If there be, get you to the other, and place yourselves there, for unto this where I am ye shall not come.'" Life and Times of W. Laud, D.D., etc. By J. P. Lawson, M.A. 1829. 8vo. vol. i. p. 155—158. Our readers will be amused, seeing the bias of this author, at his ill-fortune in attributing to the Archbishop's brother a "treatise against Bishops," which should have been "A Defence of 'the Reformed Catholic,' of William Perkins, against the Bastard 'Catholic' of Dr. Bishop, Seminary Priest.—Lond. 1606—11. 2 vols. 4to. The remarkable coincidence between Abbot and others, with Hall, concerning their judgment of Laud's leaning towards Popery, is not to be treated lightly!

^a John viii. 44.

^b Matt. xiii. 38.

Such are the expressions of this Reverend Vicar, who dedicates his book to his "Dear Mother, the much-honoured, holy, and blessed Church of England;" and who salutes her thus, "Dear and blessed Mother, Thou hast been long pestered with undutiful, yea unnatural sons:" this *natural son* thinks it possible that he might "appear of too mild a temper;" yet declares that he had "done the best" that he "thought fit for these opposers," and bids his "Dear and blessed Mother" farewell, in telling her, "I kiss thy hand, and rest thy obedient son."

Not content with having misappropriated the text in his title, through three of his sections, the Vicar describes, in the fourth, "the vice"^a of those who would be accounted truly religious, who forsake 'the assembling of ourselves together; and then have a name of pride, and a name of justice. The name of pride which they take to themselves, is 'Separatists.' They read sometimes, in the Scriptures, of 'separation,' especially where Paul saith, according to the Prophet,^b 'Come out from among them, and be ye separate.'^c . . . They will needs glory in the name of 'Separatists,' as others do of 'Catholics:' their name, of justice, is 'Brownists;' which they love not to hear of, because Browne, . . . upon wiser thoughts, returned from them, yet how justly they must retain that name may appear in that which follows."^d "His conceits, within this last age, have lived and died by turns: . . . they have had Barrowes, Greenwoods, Penries, Robinsons, Johnsons, Ainsworths, and Smyths; the only men, so far as I know, of that full strain, who have tasted of more or less learning ill placed, from Christ's time downward."^e

Enough of an opponent whose notes of charity are as dissonant from the tones of true love as his arguments are discordant from Scripture! Yet ere we dismiss him quite, we acknowledge that we are willing to forgive him, if only for the sake of one of his concluding sentences, which concedes so much, that instead of an enemy we adopt him for a friend. "The most," he says, in recording his verdict, "you pretend, are obscure passages which, by the diligentest searchers of Scriptures, have been and are diversly expounded, and therefore no sure footing; or some obscure examples without laws, which yet, if they were never so pregnant, prove but the lawfulness, not the necessity, of such practices!"^f Great is Truth!

The second treatise which we have represented as advantageous for the better insight into the entire controversy about which our pages are professedly occupied, bears the title of "A Friendly Trial of the Grounds tending to Separation: In a plain and modest Dispute touching the lawfulness of a Stinted Liturgy and Set Form of Prayer; Communion in Mixed Assemblies; and, the Primitive Subject, and First Receptacle, of the Power of the Keys. Tending to satisfy the doubtful, recall the wandering, and to strengthen the weak.—By John Ball.—1640." 4to. pp. 314.

^a Head-line of sect. iii.

^b 2 Cor. vi. 17.

^c P. 16.

^d P. 21.

^e The most curiously elaborated part of Abbot's treatise is the ninth section, of twenty-five pages, intituled "A question by the way, about Baptizing Bastards of Impenitent Christians."

^f P. 248.

Two centuries may be said to have passed by since this author,^a who is styled “an excellent schoolman and schoolmaster, a painful preacher, and a profitable writer,”^b repeated for his own the *dictum* of still older writers styled “profitable,” that “It is not for *private* persons to take that upon them which belongeth not unto their place!”^c The phraseology would seem to convey a truism, and so to defy opposition, but the sentiment intended is opposed alike to common sense and to Scripture. It is reasonable to believe that in religion as in politics, numerous individuals who never were invested with official authority are equally competent, and in many cases far more competent, to search into and judge a matter than numbers of others to whom the vestment of authority has imputed but could never impart superiority of intellect and depth of wisdom. That freedom which does not consist of the enjoyment of mental as well as of bodily independence on mere brutal coercion, is of no value. It is, however, to “private persons” peculiarly, that the beloved Apostle addresses the positive injunction “Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God.”^d Hence it is scriptural for Private Christians to take upon them to “try” their Teachers: and what fruit follows the trial, if no motive to action be allowed to ensue? They who are also enjoined, by another Apostle, to “Prove all things,”^e were in a sorry state if they had no power to reject evil, and “hold fast that which is good,” in matters which concern their everlasting salvation! Every faithful man’s “own mind”^f must, herein, be the residence of his assurance; and even his “doubtful” thoughts^g are not to be subjected to peremptory rebuke from any one, how “profitable” soever, who cannot claim to be the searcher of hearts!

Ball’s work is composed of thirteen chapters, on the subjects specified upon the title-page; but as the work must come under further review hereafter, the last in order, but the first in importance, of those subjects, will engage attention here. The thesis of the twelfth chapter, then, is “The Community of the Faithful; much less two or three, separated from the world and gathered together into the Name of Christ by a Covenant; are not the proper and immediate Subject of Power Ecclesiastical.” This position being proved, the author’s purpose, “to rase the foundation of Separation,”^h would be accomplished. Robinson’s Justification of Separation; against Bernard;ⁱ is the book controverted, But what is to be done here, with arguments of the description of that which will be produced from this twelfth chapter? Perhaps, one more

^a See back, p. 22.

^b Fuller’s “Worthies of England,” 1662. *fo.* Pt. ii. p. 339.

^c “To the Reader,” p. iv.—Richard Hooker avers in his Eccles. Polity, bk. ii. sect. 7, that the “insolency” of private judgment “concerning matter of Scripture” must be “represt.” He did not then recollect, probably, that in his Discourse of Justification, sect. 12, he had averred concerning partakers of the Error of the Church of Rome, that “The people following the conduct of their guides, and observing as they did, exactly that which was prescribed, thought they did God good service, when indeed they did dishonour him.”

^d 1 John iv. 1.

^e 1 Thess. v. 21.

^f Rom. xiv. 5.

^g Ver. 1.

^h To the Reader, p. v.

ⁱ See back, vol. i. chap. xii.

dangerous in its import, certainly not in its design, could not be selected from any other writer, short of a professed advocate of the claims of the Romish Supremacy !

“ Power Ecclesiastical, both of Order and Jurisdiction, as it is usually called, is signified by ‘ the power of the Keys,’ or ‘ the power of binding or loosing :’ but ‘ the power of the Keys’ is immediately given to the Ministers and Guides of the Church, from God ; and not from the Church, or Community of the Faithful. For ‘ the Keys’ contain not only Order, but Power, Exercise, and all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, which the Guides of the Church received immediately from Christ. As Peter received ‘ the keys of the kingdom of Heaven,’ so the rest of the Apostles ; and as the Apostles, so all their successors received them from Christ. The Apostles had extraordinary Power ; and might, in some cases, exercise it, singularly and personally, without concurrence of others ; and their Commission was of larger extent than the Charge of Ordinary Pastors or Church-governors : but the Spiritual Power to bind and loose, remit and retain sins, open and shut the kingdom of Heaven, is communicated to all Officers, from the hand and by the mandate of the same Lord and Master. One Ministerial Power, may be, in degree, of dignity above another ; for the Power of one may be about more noble acts than the power of another ; or, in the same kind, the Power of one may be more extended, and the Power of another more contracted. Thus the Deacons had for the object of their Power and care, not so excellent a thing as that of Pastors, Evangelists, and Apostles : thus the Power of Ordinary Pastors was not so universal as the Apostles’ ; even as in the orders of servants domestical, some are employed about lesser, some about greater and more honourable subjects : but all power of the servants must be derived from the same master of the family upon whom they depend, and unto whom they owe service ; and the whole Power of the Lord’s Ministers is derived immediately from Christ, and not from the Faithful knit together in covenant.”^a

What Protestant ever penned a passage of more fearful import ? The saving clause, that the Power “ is derived immediately from Christ,” would be readily admitted, and was claimed for themselves by the Papists ; and the whole paragraph is so constructed that it would not have excited much astonishment, had it been published thirty-two or three years earlier, if it had found its way into one of their most plausible productions.^b

The final chapter of this treatise, being the thirteenth, and headed “ An Examination of sundry Positions laid down by Mr. Jacob, in his Exposition of the Second Commandment, tending to Separation ;” we notice simply to inform any who may be desirous of learning where to meet with Jacob’s positions combated ; and if such should see that the

^a P. 238.

^b “ The Protestants’ Apology for the Roman Church. By John Brerely, Priest. 1608.” 4to. pp. 648. The compiler’s real name was James Anderton : his object was to entrap the unwary into a belief of the confirmation of the Popish doctrines, from the incautious concessions of Protestants ; for which purpose he had but too many colourable pretences.

negative of the positions is proved by Ball, he or they will have succeeded in penetrating through a cloud of hypotheses thick enough to obscure the mental vision of any but himself or themselves. Try for example, "To meet together in one place, is not so essential to a Church, but it may continue one, in laws, ordinances, government, and communion; though in respect of multitude, distance of place, and many other occurrences, they be constrained to assemble and hold their meetings severally. And that it was thus in the Churches planted by the Apostles, *it is most probable.*"^a Again: "It was not the Apostles' practice to ordain Pastors in those places where, as yet, no sheep were to be seen, or very few: and it had been inconvenient to tie the Faithful to one Congregation, when, by reason of multitude, they could not meet in one place to their edification. What then remaineth, but that they *might assemble* in divers places and yet hold Communion in laws, ordinances, government, and officers? When Presbyters were first assigned to their particular cures, *it is not certain.*"^b

The year 1640 presents various points of interest worthy of attention, among which it is not too much to say that the acts of the ruling Ecclesiastics were nefarious. The Parliament which assembled in April, was dissolved hastily, in the beginning of May, but the Convocation having discovered a musty precedent, of the 27th year of Elizabeth, continued its sittings, "not without some trouble of mind," says Heylyn, "in regard of the apparent danger which seemed to threaten them!"^c Their projects resulted in the publication, on the last day of June, of seventeen new Canons, of such a description as sealed and accelerated the downfall of the Episcopacy. The fifth of these Canons is directed against "All Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, Familists, or other Sect or Sects."^d The whole were so obnoxious that all parties, and some even in the Church itself, had ground of complaint against one or other of them. Tumults it is true, had previously occurred; for, on Monday, May the 11th, the "Archbishop's house at Lambeth, had been assaulted by a rabble of Anabaptists, Brownists, and other Sectaries," so says Heylyn, "to the number of five hundred and upwards; but seeing they could not force that house, resolved to turn their fury on the Convocation. . . To such extremities were the poor Clergy brought during these confusions; in danger of the King's displeasure, if they rose; of the People's fury, if they sate; in danger of being beaten up by tumults when they were at their work; of being beaten down by the following Parliament, when their work was done."^e Happily, the Convocation had not accomplished all its projects: "There had been a design," Heylyn tells us, "touching the drawing and digesting of an English Pontifical!" But the troubles of the times growing greater and greater, it was thought expedient "to defer the prosecution of it till a fitter conjuncture." Heylyn adds, "It is a matter which deserves no small admiration, that these Canons—like the first building of the Temple, without the noise of axe and hammer,—should pass the House with

^a P. 298.^b P. 299.^c Life of Laud, p. 430.^d The name "Independents" not being mentioned, is thought to prove that it had not yet become popularly known.^e Life of Laud, p. 430.

such a general calm, and be received with so many storms and tempests when they went abroad!"^a The House of Commons, in the "following" Parliament, December the 16th, voted the "whole body" of those Canons, "to be against the fundamental laws of the realm; against the King's prerogative; the property of the subject; the right of Parliaments; and, to tend to faction and sedition."^b A more comprehensive indictment cannot well be imagined; but with some divines the Church never errs! It excited ferment enough, however, for even while the High Commission was sitting at St. Paul's, October the 22nd, "a mixt multitude," as it is alleged, "of Brownists, Anabaptists, and Puritans, of all sorts, to the number of two thousand and upwards" dispersed the Court; crying out "No Bishops! No High Commission!"^c From which it would appear that there were no other Patriots, in those days; but they could not claim that honour exclusively, lest the dishonour of all the excesses oppression drove them and others into, should be theirs also.

Heylyn found how things were going with the Church; and saw that that decline was commenced and almost consummated, which, he says, "our judicious Hooker had presaged; who had assigned her 'fourscore' years for her growth and flourishing, and nothing afterwards but sorrow and disconsolation. For," he goes on to say, "finding nothing more frequent in the mouths of men than this, 'That they which endowed Churches with lands, poisoned religion; that tithes and oblations, are now in the sight of God as the sacrificed blood of goats; . . . and that fulness of bread having made the children wanton, it is without any scruple to be taken away from them;' he made upon the whole matter," continues Heylyn, "this ensuing judgment: 'By this means,' saith he, 'or the like suggestions, received with all joy, and with like sedulity practised in certain parts of the Christian world, they have brought to pass that as David doth say of man, so it is in hazard to be verified concerning the whole religion and service of God—The time thereof may peradventure fall out to be threescore years and ten, —or if strength do serve unto fourscore,^d what followeth is likely to be

^a *Ibid.* p. 442.—"The Convocation-house—the regular and legal assembling of the clergy—customarily beginning and ending with Parliaments, was, after the determination of the last, by a new writ continued, and sate for the space of above a month under the proper title of a Synod; made Canons, which was thought it might do; and gave subsidies out of Parliament, and enjoined oaths, which certainly it might not do: in a word, did many things which in the best of times might have been questioned, and therefore were sure to be condemned in the worst,—what fuel it was to the fire that ensued, shall be mentioned in its place,—and drew the same prejudice upon the whole body of the clergy to which, before only some few clergymen were exposed." Clarendon, *Hist. Rebel.* pt. i. bk. ii. ed. 8vo. 1721. vol. i. p. 148.

^b *Life of Laud*, p. 442.

^c P. 453.—"A book was published by the name of 'Landensium Autocatacrisis; or, The Canterburian's Self-Conviction;' in which the author of it ['Robert Baillie'] did endeavour to prove out of the books, speeches, and writings of the Archbishop himself, as also of some Bishops, and other learned men, who had exercised their pens in the late disputes, That there was a strange design in hand for bringing in Superstition, Popery, and Arminianism." P. 455.

^d *Psal.* xc. 10.

small joy for them, whosoever they be, that behold the same.^a An observation," continues Heylyn, "which seems to savour more of the prophet than it did of the priest, and to have as much divination as divinity in it!"^b

The proceedings against Burton, Prynne, and Bastwick, related heretofore, will not lose in their interest by a further relation of their return from their respective abodes of captivity; which was attended with all the circumstantialia of a popular triumph. From the authority which we shall continue to cite,^c it appears that Laud had no relentings towards his victims; that he had treated with the Queen not to be induced to intercede with the King on their behalf,—“not to intermeddle in their business.”^d Prynne had, however, obtained through the medium of Sir Thomas Jermyn, certain relaxations of the strictness of his confinement, which the Archbishop hearing of “was so enraged”^e that he imputed forgery to the instrument which his Majesty had sanctioned; but the Earl of Dorset attesting its authenticity, it was subsequently shown to Sir Dudley Carleton, “and so the Prelate, unable to reverse it, was forced to let it pass, against his good will!”^f

The same narrative continues by stating that “It pleased God, not long after this, beyond the Prelates’ expectation, to bring a Parliament together, . . . but breaking up, suddenly, in discontent, by the Prelates’ machinations, before any petitions preferred on their [the prisoners’] behalf, they still remained hopeless of all human deliverance. But the Great Moderator of the Universe miraculously turning all the Prelates’ pernicious designs against our State and Church, upon themselves; and fettering them in the snares they had laid to entrap others, contrary to their elevated hopes and thoughts, unexpectedly caused and summoned this second Parliament; to the ineffable happiness both of the present and future ages.”^g

No sooner was Parliament assembled than several petitions were presented to the Commons, that the prisoners “might all be sent for out of hand, to prosecute their grievances and complaints before them, against their [the Prelates’] unjust Censures. Which petitions were cordially received and readily granted.” One of the Warrants certifying accordingly, represents that “It is Ordered this day, by the Commons House of Parliament, that a Warrant shall issue forth under Mr. Speaker’s hand, directed to the Governor . . . of Castle Cornet, in the Isle of Guernsey, . . . to send up to the said House of Commons, in safe custody, Mr. Henry Burton, . . . that he may, before them, prosecute his complaint, according to a Petition this day delivered to this House by Mrs. Sarah Burton, his wife. And, withal, to require them whom it may concern, to certify to the House, by what Warrant and Autho-

^a Hooker’s Eccles. Polity, bk. v. sect. 79, *apud fn.* This Fifth Book was printed in 1597. Heylyn calculates, however, from “the beginning of the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth, 1558, to the Pacification made at Berwick, 1639.” P. 449.

^b P. 450. ^c “A New Discovery, &c.” See back, vol. i. p. 510. ^d P. 110.

^e “Yet this man, in his Epistle to the King, before his Relation of his Conference with Fisher, published about this time to blear the world, writes “That he heartily beseeched God to forgive these three bitter men.” *Ibid.* p. 110. *marg.*

^f P. 111.

^g *Ib.*

rity he is there detained close prisoner. . . Dated this present 7th day of November, 1640.—William Lenthall, Speaker.”^a

Burton and Prynne arrived together, on Saturday the 28th of November, “to the great joy of all good people.” From Dartmouth, where they landed, all the way to London, their journey resembled a triumphal procession, increasing as it approached “to Charing Cross, where they encountered such a world of people in the streets,” that it was nearly three hours in passing from Charing Cross to their lodging in the City, having torches carried to light them.” The bells “rang, in most places ; . . and the company that rode with them into London were estimated to be about a hundred coaches, many of them having six horses apiece; and at least two thousand horse; those on foot being innumerable.”^b

On Monday morning they appeared before the Commons, when liberty was granted them “to frame new Petitions in their own names.” Prynne’s was presented on the third of December, and Burton’s on the fifth. A Special Committee, of sixty members, was ordered, to take the parties into hearing; “to receive all Petitions of like nature; and to examine the jurisdiction, and abuses, of the Star Chamber, the High Commission, and Council Table :” it met, the same day, in the Star Chamber Court, and appointed Alexander Rigby, of Gray’s Inn, Chairman.^c

The prayer of Prynne’s Petition ran in these words, “May it, therefore, please this Honourable House, to take these your Petitioner’s almost eight years tragical grievances, of new and dangerous example, into your most sad and just considerations; that so they may not become precedents to the prejudice of posterity. To grant him liberty to send for and examine all necessary witnesses: to order all clerks, registers, and other officers of the Star Chamber, or elsewhere, speedily and freely to grant him the copies of such orders, decrees, and writings, as his cause shall require: to release him upon bail, being now but a prisoner only upon an extra-judicial order of the Lords, and not by virtue of any sentence or decree in Court: to grant him liberty to plead and prosecute his own cause, since counsel hath so often failed him; and, to give him such satisfaction and relief, as the justice and equity of his cause shall merit.”^d

Burton’s petition prays, after having recited all the processes concerning himself, “May it, therefore, please this Honourable House, to take the Petitioner’s sad cause into consideration; and for the better manifestation of his grievance in this cause, to assign him for counsel Master Serjeant Atkins, Master Tomlins, and Master Gurdon, to assist him in his cause; and to command, that he may take out such copies *gratis* out of the said several Courts, as do or may concern his said cause.”^e Dr. Bastwick’s was similar. He had landed at Dover, on the fourth of December, and was, on Monday the sixth, met and brought into London, nearly as his fellow-sufferers had been; who “supped with him, at a friend’s house, that same night.”^f His cause, though

^a P. 112.

^d P. 125.

^b P. 113—115.

^e P. 130.

^c P. 116.

^f P. 135.

the last heard, being the shortest was first reported to the House by Mr. Rigby; Burton's next; and Prynne's last. The whole House voted unanimously, all the Censures, Proceedings, and Orders, against the several parties, illegal.^a

The Votes, in Burton's cause, March 12th, 1640-1, were to the pronouncing illegal the proceedings of Dr. Duck, and others; and adjudging "reparations and recompence." The Warrant from the Council-Board, Feb. 2nd, 1636-7, for Burton's committal, was pronounced "illegal, and contrary to the liberty of the subject." The Archbishop, the Bishop of London, and five others, Earls, etc., were ordered to "make reparations" to him. And, on the 10th of March, it was resolved "That the Sentence in the Star Chamber against Mr. Burton is illegal, and without any just ground, and ought to be reversed, etc.: That he ought to be restored to his degrees taken in the University, and orders in the Ministry; and to his Ecclesiastical Benefice in Friday-street, London: That the Order of the Council-Board for transferring him from the Castle of Lancaster to the Isle of Guernsey; and the imprisonment of him there; are against law, and the liberty of the subject: and, That he ought to have reparation and recompence for the damages sustained by his said imprisonment, loss of ears, exile, and other evils sustained by him by the said unjust and illegal proceedings.—Signed, "H. Elsynge, Cler. Domus Com."^b On the 8th of June, under the same signature, "The House of Commons doth this day declare and hold fit, That Mr. Henry Burton shall be restored to his former liberty of Preaching."^c

The Compiler of the "New Discovery" brings his labours to this conclusion: "It will be but equal, that these tyrannical bloody Lord Prelates should now be so dealt with in the Honourable Court of Parliament, as themselves have formerly dealt with others for far less crimes than those they are now accused and guilty of; and that they should have 'judgment without mercy,' who have 'showed no mercy,' and whose 'tender mercies'^d have been cruelties!"^e In the Dedicatory Epistle, however, the Compiler wrote thus, "Kind Reader,—I here present thee with a late tragical history, or New Discovery of the Prelates' Tyranny in their unjust prosecutions and bloody persecutions of these eminent persons of the three most noble professions in the kingdom; divinity, law, physic, all suffering together on the pillory,—much honoured by them, and they by it,—and losing all their ears at once, to make themselves hear better, and the Prelates worse!^f Such 'a spectacle,' both to men and angels,^g no age ever saw before; and posterity is never like to behold hereafter.

"To hear of Lord Bishops metamorphosed into 'ravenous wolves'^h is no novelty; they have been thus in every age, and will be so while they have continuance. But to see them mounted to such an altitude of authority and tyranny as to crucify divinity, law, physic, on the pillory together, and to make Judges, Peers, and Courts of Justice, if

^a P. 137.^b P. 141.^c P. 145.^d Jas. ii. 13. Prov. xii. 10.^e P. 226.^f "Qui malè facit, malè audit."^g 1 Cor. iv. 9.^h Acts xx. 29. Matt. vii. 15.

not Sovereignty itself, the Executioners^a of their malice, cruelty, and private revenge, by such extravagant and untrodden courses as were unknown to our ancestors is such a prodigious innovation, as neither Africa nor England ever beheld the like; and never had been brought forth into the world, had not a venomous Arch-prelate proved a father to engender, a mother to foster, a midwife to produce and bring it to its birth. But, alas, poor silly Politician! while he sought these innocents' ruin by those unwarrantable practices, he laid but the foundation of his own overthrow; in the 'snare' that he laid for them, is his own foot taken; into the 'pit' that he digged for them, he is fallen himself; his snares are broken, they 'are escaped,' and he now lies entangled in them. He is 'cast down and fallen;' but they 'are risen, and stand upright:' his 'mischief' now returns 'on his own head, and his violent dealing comes down upon his own pate:' 'evil' now hunts this man of violence 'to overthrow him;' and 'the mischief' of his 'own lips' doth 'cover him.' As he 'hath done,' so 'God hath requited him;' while he made 'haste' to shed their 'blood,' he did but lie 'in wait' for his 'own.' And he that did 'violence to the blood' of these persons, now fleeth 'to the pit,'—as God hath threatened,—'let no man stay him;' but let all stand admiring God's justice upon him, and his admirable providence, and mercy, in preserving, delivering, and acquitting^b them from his unjust Censures, and that in the highest court of justice, without one negative voice!

"The manifestation of this remarkable justice, mercy, and providence, of our Great God,—'glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, working wonders,' not only of old,^c but at this present, even in all our eyes, doing 'great things' for these Patients; for the whole land; 'whereof we rejoice,'^d was the chief end of publishing this Discovery, whereby to daunt all graceless Persecutors, and cheer the souls of all sincere professors."

The transactions connected with these men, their prosecutors, and their vindicators, are condensed in his History, by Clarendon, who stigmatizes the sufferers as "men of no virtue or merit," and describes their reception, on their return, as an "insurrection and frenzy of the people."^e His Lordship adds, "From this time the license of Preaching and Printing increased to that degree that all Pulpits were freely delivered to the schismatical and silenced Preachers, who, till then, had lurked in corners, or lived in New England; and the presses at liberty for the publishing the most invective, seditious, and scurrilous pamphlets that their wit and malice could invent."^f It was about this time that

^a See Fox, Acts and Men, vol. i. p. 526, edit [ante 1641.]

^b Psal. xxxviii. 5, 6.

^c Exod. xv. 11.

^d Psal. cxxvi. 2, 3.

^e Hist. Rebel. pt. i. bk. iii. p. 201, 202.—"The more ignoble these men were," writes Hume, "the more sensible was the insult upon royal authority, and the more dangerous was the spirit of disaffection and mutiny, which it discovered among the people." Hist. Char. I. ch. liv. an. 1640. Baillie writes, Dec. 2nd. "Never here such a like show; above a thousand horse, and as some of good note say, above four thousand; above a hundred coaches, and as some say, above two hundred; with a world of foot, every one with a rosemary branch... This galled the Bishops exceedingly." Vol. i. Let. 20, p. 222.

^f P. 202.

Bishop Hall lamented, in a Speech to the Lords, "That there should be in London and the suburbs and liberties, no fewer than fourscore congregations of several Sectaries, as I have been too credibly informed, instructed by guides fit for them, cobblers, tailors, feltmakers, and such like trash; which are all taught to spit in the face of their mother, the Church of England; and to defy and revile her government."^a Who, and of what denominations these were, it is not our present business to describe.

CHAP. XXXVII.

THE SCOTS' DEPUTATION.—CANNE.—PAGET.—DAVENPORT.—DEAD-MAN'S PLACE.

WE turn to introduce a fresh set of our opponents, formidable, indeed, in their own might, as will be amply evinced; but who were unexpectedly to themselves kept at bay, and were often even repelled in an encounter, by instruments contemptible, at first, in their eyes, till they found "the oracles of God"^b came sounding from their mouths, with the invincible majesty of Truth.

Scotland might justly boast of her prowess in the struggle for Reformation; she was become, however, if not "vain" in her "imagination,"^c yet filled with a vain imagination that she had "all sufficiency in all things:"^d for so we may be allowed to infer from what was arranged and transpired at Newcastle, connected with the procedure of her commissioners and others to London; and which we shall present from an authority to whom we shall be beholden for much curious and some strange matter connected also with the interests of religion at large, and with those promoters of it in whom we are most particularly concerned.

In a Letter dated "Newcastle, Nov. 5th, 1640," that sturdy and noted Presbyterian, Robert Baillie, writes, "At our presbytery, after sermon, both our noblemen and ministers, in one voice, thought meet that not only Mr. Alexander Henderson, but, also, Mr. Robert Blair, Mr. George Gillespie, and I, should, all three [four], for divers ends, go to London: Mr. R. Blair, to satisfy the minds of many in England who love the Way of New England better than that of Presbyteries used in our Church; I, for convincing of that prevalent faction against which I have written; Mr. Gillespie, for the crying down of the English Ceremonies, for which, he has written; and all four to preach, by turns, to our Commissioners."^e In another Letter, dated "London, Dec. 2nd, 1640," he writes thus, "Say, and Brooke, in the Higher House, and

^a Works, vol. x. p. 65.

^b Heb. v. 12.

^c Rom. i. 21.

^d 2 Cor. ix. 8.

^e Let. 18, vol. i. p. 215, of "Letters and Journals: Containing an impartial account of Public Transactions, &c. From the beginning of the Civil Wars in 1637, to the year 1662.—From the MSS. of Robert Baillie, D.D., 1775." 2 vols. 8vo.

these alone, and some leading men in the Lower, were suspected, by their inclination to the Separatists, would divide from the Presbyterians, and so weaken the party opposite to Bishops: but so far as yet can be perceived, that party inclinable to Separation will not be considerable [!] and, whatever it be, these and the rest who are for the Scots discipline, do amicably conspire in one to overthrow the Bishops and ceremonies, hoping, when these 'rudera' are put away, that they shall well agree to build a new house, when the ground is well swept."^a

December 19th, Baillie writes, "The Separatists are like to be some help to hold up the Bishops through their impertinency; but we trust, by God's blessing on our labours, to prevent that evil."^b

"The godly here," he writes, January 29th, 1640-1, "meet oft in private houses, for in public they dare not; fast and pray, and hear gracious sermons, for whole days, sundry times in the week. . . In the adverse party, we hear of little devotion in the best of them."^c And, March 15th, "All the English Ministers of Holland who are for New England Way, are now here: how strong their party will be here is diversely reported: they are all on good terms with us. Our only considerable difference will be about the jurisdiction of synods and presbyteries. As for Brownists, and Separatists of many kinds here, they mislike them well near as much as we: of these there is no considerable party. Anent [concerning] private meetings, we know here no difference we have with any. Our questions with them of the New Way we hope to get determined to our mutual satisfaction, if we were rid of Bishops, and till then, we have agreed to speak nothing of anything wherein we differ. Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Hooker, Mr. Baronds [Burroughes,] Mr. Simonds [Simpson,] have all written very gracious treatises of sanctification, which I mind to bring with me. All of them are learned, discreet, and zealous men, well seen in cases of conscience. It were all the pities in the world that they and we should differ in anything, especially in that one which, albeit very small in speculation, yet in practice of very huge consequence: for making every congregation an absolute and independent Church over which presbyteries and general assemblies have no power of censure, but only of charitable admonition; my wit sees not how incontinent a National Church should not fall into unspeakable confusions, as I am confident the goodness of God will never permit so gracious men to be the occasions of, let be the authors."^d

Dismissing Baillie for awhile, we set before the reader, "Sion's^e Prerogative Royal: or, A Treatise tending to prove That every Particular Congregation hath, from Christ, absolute and entire power to exercise, in and of Herself, every Ordinance of God: And is an independent body, not standing under any other Ecclesiastical Authority out of itself. By a Wellwisher to the Truth.—1 Cor. iii. 21. 'All, &c.' Psal. cxlix. 9. 'This, etc.'—Printed at Amsterdam, in the year 1641." 16mo. pp. 64.

"I hope," says the author, to the Courteous Reader, "to make it

^a P. 220.

^b P. 227.

^c P. 235.

^d P. 253.

^e "Syon's;" so spelled in the original title, and in some Catalogues.

perspicuous and plain to every judicious and indifferent [impartial] Reader, That whereas the Papists place the Power of Christ given to the Church, in the Pope; the Protestants, in the Bishops; the Reformed Churches, as they are called, in the Presbytery;—that neither of them, has right in this thing: but, contrariwise, That Jesus Christ, Lord and King of his Church, hath given the said power of his to all his Saints; and placed it in the Body of every Particular Congregation: so that He hath not subjected any Church of His to any Superior Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction than that unto which is in itself." This, he proceeds to do, in the treatise, by arguments grounded on the Scriptures; showing also "what is the judgment of learned men;" and, by giving answer to "such objections as may seem to carry most weight against the same." We do not consider it necessary to enlarge our description of this piece; the information it contains being treated of, up and down, in our pages. If the piece be Canne's, as tradition represents, he will soon be under our notice again. So soon, that we fall at once upon what its author gave intimation of, as recorded in our first volume, p. 546,^a namely "A Defence of Church Government, Exercised in Presbyterial, Classical, and Synodal Assemblies, according to the Practice of the Reformed Churches: Touching, 1. The Power of a particular Eldership; against them that plead for a mere Popular Government, specially Mr. Ainsworth, in his 'Animadversion to Mr. Clyfton, etc.' 2. The Authority of Classes and Synods; against the Patrons of Independency: Answering in this point, Mr. Davenport, in his 'Apologetical Reply, etc.;' and Mr. Canne, his 'Churches Plea, etc.,' sent forth first by W. Best, and afterwards for this part of it, under the title of 'Sion's Prerogative Royal.' By John Paget, late able and faithful Pastor of the Reformed English Church in Amsterdam.—Hereunto is prefixed an Advertisement to the Parliament, wherein are inserted some Animadversions on the Cheshire Remonstrance against Presbytery: by T. P. [Thomas Paget.]—Lond. 1641." 4to. pp. 255.

Commencing with what the latter part of this title relates to, it is in the "Advertisement" described as "That unworthy 'Remonstrance against Presbytery' represented to the House of Peers from divers Noblemen and Gentlemen of Cheshire, as appeareth by a printed book, under the name of 'Sir Thomas Aston, Bart., 1641.'—The pretended occasion of the Remonstrance against Presbytery, alleged by the contrivers and subscribers, is 'A Petition; and Positions preached at Chester and Knutsford,' annexed to the Remonstrance. The occasion of the suggested pretence is but a mere pretence; having no just ground at all: for neither the Petition nor Positions . . do seek for Presbytery; but seem rather to affect a Popular Government." We judge that this production proceeds upon the principles of Erastianism, because under the cover of placing Presbytery with the Separatists, etc., Prelacy is the object intended to be promoted; for which deceptive procedure,

^a The full title of the Protestation mentioned there, is "A Protestation made and published by John Davenporte, upon Occasion of a Pamphlet intituled 'A Just Complaint against an Unjust Doer,' published by a nameless Person.—Prov. xxvi. 17; Matt. x. 16, 17.—Printed at Rotterdam, 1635." 4to. pp. [6.]

these "Cheshiremen" are told that it "behoveth" them to give "righteous judgment."^a

The Publisher's address, "To the Christian Reader," subscribed R. Paget, Dort, informs us that the former part of "the ensuing treatise was written about the year 1618;" and that the greater part of the Defence "is in way of answer to Mr. Canne, who hath been the forwardest and longest in this part of the plea touching Classes and Synods: it seems also, that he hath not been a little confident of his pains about this work, by the reiterated editions and sundry shapes into which this his writing touching Independent Government hath been cast. The first edition which the Author here deals with,^b was seconded with another into which he hath taken only that which concerns this controversy, adorning it with this new and fair title, 'Sion's Prerogative Royal, 1641;' and this hath been answered by the famous and truly excellent divine of these countries, Dr. Voetius:^c a third edition it seems hath been put forth, with some additions against the Presbyteries of particular churches, under another title, namely, 'The Presbyterial Government Examined;' and this also hath been examined and answered by the author of the 'Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, &c. Edinb. 1641,' in the Postscript thereunto annexed. Thus,

^a John vii. 24.

^b "The Church's Plea for her Right: Or, A Reply to an Answer made of Mr. John Paget against William Best and others. Wherein the main points of our present Differences are handled, and the principal Causes of our Troubles declared. Published by William Best.—At Amsterdam, 1635." 4to. pp. 100. "For the manner of this writing,"—so Best is made to say, in a "Fore-speech to the Christian Reader,"—"whosoever shall consider either the subject here treated of, or the persons whom it chiefly respecteth, will, I think, confess that there lay a necessity upon me to use the best means I could to have it done unto some effectual purpose. But for my part I must confess, and so I would have all men in all places to know, that I am not in myself of the ability to compose a work of this nature; and therefore, through my entreaty and desire, others more able have taken some pains for me herein, both in seeking out learned authors, as also setting them down in the places as they stand: on whose fidelity, skill, and care, I have presumed the publishing of them to the world; having this confidence in the Person, or Persons, that they will stand to justify all the allegations according to the end and use here produced; and if just occasion be offered, it may be they will add something more thereunto. . . Touching Mr. Paget's person, I hope all men shall see by the care which I have had to avoid all bitterness, and unreverend speeches, howbeit often provoked to it, that I bear no ill will against him; truly I do not. . . So for the Classis, they are men whom I much reverence, and worship God with my soul for the gifts and graces which appear in them. Notwithstanding, for their assuming unto themselves authority over our Congregation, this my mind gives me is their failing, and it cannot by God's Word be justified. Besides, we are a people of another nation, whose language they know not, at least most of them; and therefore to me it seems strange that they should undertake the care and charge of us, being in this regard, most unfit for it. I am persuaded, put aside this last age, there will not be found an example of the like practice anywhere since the apostles' days. . . The thing that I chiefly aim at is that the churches of God, hereafter, may keep and practise the ordinances of Jesus Christ, and not, under a pretence to have things better than the Lord's own institutions, to give place unto the sinful devices of men. . . It is given out that he professeth a marvellous desire to see his book answered before he dies. Now as he shall have his content herein, so God grant that he make that good use of it as he ought, and I wish he may." The whole work is able and pertinent.

^c Disput. Theol. de Unione Ecclesiarum, earumque Regimine in Classibus et Synodis, par. post. Utraj. 1641.

the same writing hath met with several refutations, whereof, though this be the last in birth, yet it was the first in conception. . For the seasonableness of it, let the times speak. . . That which thou here seest, touching Classes and Synods, was written by the author in the latter days of his pilgrimage. . There are now three years expired since he rested from this and other his labours."

We are referred, in the opening page of the treatise itself, for the occasion of the first part of it, to the author having, in his "Arrow against Separation" desired Mr. Ainsworth to set down his reasons concerning whatsoever he thought might be a just cause of refusing communion with that particular congregation whereof he was a minister; ^a "Mr. Ainsworth in his answer, amongst the rest, hath these words, 'Other things there are, wherein you know we differ from you; . . your Eldership sitteth and judgeth matters apart from the Congregation, &c.'"^b

Concerning the interference of the Magistrate to repress "contentions and schisms," after noticing the case of the contention among the Johnsons, Francis and George, brothers, and their father, John, aged seventy; ^c "and, since that time, when the 'Brownists' have so often schismed and rent in the midst, as in Mr. Johnson and Mr. Ainsworth's division, when they separated one from the other; when, after the death of Mr. Ainsworth, that company rending again in the midst, one half followed John De Cluse, and the other Mr. Canne; when, after the death of Mr. Robinson, his company also, rending in pieces, they forsook their old fellowship together; when Mr. Canne was first rashly elected a minister by the 'Brownists,' when, shortly after that election, he was censured and deposed from his office, by that half that rejected him and renounced communion with him."^d Paget's remark on these various proceedings is, that "in all these and the like controversies they wanted help, and durst not seek the benefit of Classical Government, nor submit their cause unto such an order of trial and censure, lest they should enthrall themselves in 'antichristian bondage,' as they call it." A little longer reflection would have raised a suspicion, whether as these parties entertained so great an abhorrence of Classical Government, it might have arisen from what they had heard or seen of its ill-working! For it seems otherwise impossible that all these "Brownists" should have persisted in arguing against "Classical Government." And what motive but that of principle alone, admitting them even to have been mistaken, could decide their conduct, we are at a loss to conjecture. It would seem strange also that they who denied the Scriptural authority of Classical Government altogether, should ever inquire after the "counsel" it could offer. We take it, that Paget has virtually given up his cause where, concerning "Discipline, or Church Government, appointed of God, [!] and practised in the Reformed Churches," ^e he remarks, "although the importance of this controversy doth hereby appear plainly enough; yet do we not hold the same to be so great as some of our opposites do make it, as if the essence of the Church and our own sal-

^a Arrow against Separation, sig. f. 2. v. See back, vol. i. p. 326.

^b See back, vol. i. p. 329.

^c See back, vol. i. p. 99.

^d P. 32. See back, vol. i. p. 516.

^e P. 29.

vation depended hereupon." ^a He admits too, that "The Church of England, and of these Countries, though they have a different order of Church Government, yet, holding, together, the same fundamental truths of the Gospel, they both do hold but one way to Heaven; and so do both mutually acknowledge one another to be in that way." ^b Wherefore then, could not Paget concede that much for other Churches which hold "the same fundamental truths?"

Canne having said that "It is against sense that a minister should undertake the care of more churches than one only," and asked, "Who reads, in Scripture, of a steward over many families, a shepherd over divers flocks, &c.?" adding, "Nature hath ordained, saith Aristotle, 'one unto one;'" ^d Paget replies, "then must Mr. Canne be a man against 'nature' above many other!... How durst he take the pastoral charge of a church upon him; and this, alone, without assistance of an Eldership? And yet, in the meantime, undertake the care and charge of divers other trades, as of a Printer's work house, in one place; of a Brandery, or aquavita shop, in another place; and 'specially of an Alchymist's laboratory, in another place? Is this paragon of the Separation, a fit man to be an advocate or patron of the churches, to write a book and intitule it 'The Church's Plea?'" ^e

This elaborate but most fallacious treatise may be dismissed with stating the broad assumption in R. Paget's Supplement, that it is a "false" supposition, "That this appertains to the due liberty of the People—To have their judgment sought unto, for the determining of all controversies that arise in the Church:" and with the declaration, that, "We maintain on the other side, that this is no part of the People's privilege, because it is not due unto them by any divine warrant: and herein we are further confirmed, seeing such an order is, in outward appearance, and according to undeniable experience, in the Anabaptists, Brownists, and others, attended with manifold disorders, confusion and dissipation of churches." ^f All this might be alleged of Presbyterian churches of that age, and consequently the absence of a "divine warrant" for Classical Government, could be assumed upon the like premises.

But this treatise of Paget's was not intended to be unaccompanied by a special rejoinder. For reasons that appear beneath we are induced to place our particulars in this subordinate position, chiefly to prevent the solecism which would otherwise be created by imagining that they had from their original existence been part of the ingredients which were producing consistency and stability in the minds of those whom they were collectively designed to confirm. The tract alluded to is "The Power of Congregational Churches Asserted and Vindicated: In Answer to a Treatise of Mr. J. Paget, Intituled, 'The Defence of Church Government, exercised in Classes and Synods.' By John Davenport, B.D., and Pastor to the Church in Newhaven in New England.—Isai. i. 26.—London, Printed in the Year 1672." 16mo. pp. 179.

The Publisher, who signs himself, "M. N. May 28th, 1672," begins his address to the Reader with these words: "The disposals of God in his providence with reference to the travels of Truth and bringing forth of light, are much to be observed... There hath been a great and overruling Hand exerted, and that very conspicuously, about this present treatise. The reverend and learned and eminently accomplished author, first finished a tractate with this title, and on this sub-

^a P. 33. ^b P. 161. ^c Lib. i. cap. 2. ^d P. 159. ^e P. 160. ^f P. 247.

ject, near thirty years ago. But God's time was not yet come for its publishing; it perished, therefore, in the rude waves of the vast ocean with some other excellent manuscripts and precious christians. Nevertheless, some seven years after, God set him about it again, and then he finished what is now, after twenty years more, thus made public. . . It was several months since, sent over from New England with desire that it might be printed. The wise and all-disposing providence of God allotted this as the season for it; and in His season all things have a peculiar beauty. . . There are two things [which] run through this whole discourse and are legible in every line of it, 1st, That the power of churches is confined to their *res propria*, their own proper matters: 2nd, That there is not any [extraneous] *spiritual* church power, to which they are, by any institution of Christ, subjected. Two grand and pillar-principles of the Congregational Way; both of them abundantly cleared from mistakes, and established upon Scripture foundations. . . This book, after many others which speak the same language, may render it plain and evident to impartial and understanding readers [that] the principles and practices of the Congregational Way are not, in truth, so incompatible with the power of the supreme magistrate in matters of religion as some would represent, nor such as may render them suspected to civil powers; and that therefore we may not for these our principles, be accounted unworthy to enjoy a peaceable dwelling in our native land, the weal whereof is more dear to us than our lives, or all our private earthly enjoyments in it."

In a short proem, Davenport divides "The Church's Charter" into the constitution of particular visible churches, and the privileges and power given to such churches. He announces that he "shall principally insist on the metaphor of a corporation or body-politic, such as that of the chiefest and most perfect cities is," because he finds that this similitude is frequently expressed in Scripture;^a but he forbears to apply it further than "the light of Truth" therein will direct and warrant. "There we find the grand charter itself, and the ancient precedents of the first [only primitive] Christian churches planted by the apostles: according to these records, I shall endeavour to declare the mind of Christ, whom God the Father commands us to 'hear' in all things whatsoever he saith unto us, and that under a dreadful penalty.^b Whence," he adds, "Cyprian doth well infer, 'If only Christ is to be heard, we ought not to attend [mind] what any before us thought should be done; but what Christ, who is before all, hath done, and appointed to be done. For we ought not to follow the custom of men, but the Truth of God, seeing the Lord saith by the prophet Isaiah,^c This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, &c., teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.'^d The charter according to which particular churches are to be constituted, and their power *in re propria* is to be stated, we find in Matt. xvi. 18, 19." He then evinces in Chap. i. "The principal efficient cause" of a visible church; "I"—"the Christ,"—"I will build, etc." By "my spirit," Zech. iv. 6; therefore, "God's building," 1 Cor. iii. 9. Hence He is "the only immediate author and instituter of particular visible churches"—He giveth each of them "the keys." His headship is evinced, generally, from Heb. iii. 3—5; particularly, by induction, John x. 9—1 Cor. xii. 18, Eph. iv. 7—Eph. iv. 16—1 Pet. ii. 5—1 Cor. xii. 28—Eph. iv. 8, 11—Col. ii. 10—12—1 Cor. xi. 23, etc.—Jas. iv. 12—1 Cor. xii. 3—Rev. iii. 7—1 Cor. v. 4, 5—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. His right is threefold, first, from Psal. ii. 7, 8; John iii. 35; v. 22, 23: secondly, from Acts xx. 28; Phil. ii. 9—11; Matt. xxviii. 18—20: thirdly, from Col. i. 13. Consequently, "from Christ building his house, followeth his being over his house," Heb. iii. 3, 6; as "Lord" of it, Acts, ii. 36; and as the only political Head of it, in three respects, Col. i. 18, John iii. 34; Eph. v. 22—24; John xv. 5. He is not the Head only of the catholic church, but also of every particular church: his subjects are visible believers, professing their faith in Him and their subjection to his laws and ordinances, 2 Cor. ix. 13; the church is complete in Him alone, Col. ii. 10; no creature can discharge his office, Eph. i. 20—23. Consequently, it is not "in the power of earthly kings or states, or civil courts, to make ecclesiastical laws, or to invent or impose any rites or forms of worship upon churches, according to

^a Psal. xlviii. 1, 2; lxxxvii. 3; Isai. xxvi. 1; lx. 14; Ezek. xl. 1; xlviii. 35; Rev. iii. 12; xx. 9; xxi. 2; xxii. 14, 19; Luke xix. 14.

^b Acts iii. 22, 23.

^c Matt. xv. 8, 9.

^d Ad. Cœcil., lib. ii. ep. iii.

principles of state-policy or human prudence." And, consequently, "every particular visible church must exalt Christ and his institutions alone, in their whole church order, and in all their administrations: this, is their visible receiving, Col. ii. 5, 6." The wrath of Christ is not less formidable to us, or his jealousy less incensed against those that either add to, or take from, or alter his institutions now, than in times past; but rather more, Heb. xii. 25—29.

Chap. ii. In no other way than thus succinctly, can Davenport's line of argument and mode of illustration be set before our readers. The "material cause" of a visible church is the "rock" whereupon it is built, 1 Cor. iii. 11; as preached, Eph. ii. 20; as believed and confessed, Rom. x. 9, 10. "Seeing it pleaseth Christ to use men as his instruments in building his church, Zech. vi. 15, Eph. iv. 11, 12; he is content that they improve the judgment which they have... Officers and members judge by 'the outward appearance,' 1 Sam. xvi. 7; therefore their judgment is fallible... Their duty is to proceed as far as men may, by rule, with due moderation and gentleness to try them who offer themselves to fellowship: though when they have done all, close hypocrites will creep in." "Such as having been baptized in their infancy, when they did nonnihil adolescere, were catechised, and being found to be believers were *confirmed* by imposition of hands, and admitted unto the Lord's table, and unto the full fruition of all church-privileges.^a These, Clemens calls Incipientes, and Novitios; and so do others, from 1 Tim. iii. 6. As 'the mystery of iniquity' wrought, .. this custom, in the right use of it, ceased; and Popery, retained only the name of 'Confirmation,' but corrupted the thing and turned it into a sacrament, limiting the administration of it to diocesan prelates." Cranmer, under Edward VI. endeavoured to introduce the right use of it, and committed the censure of the Common Prayer Book to Bucer, who found that those who were to be confirmed must say the apostles' creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments; and answer the questions in the short catechism. "This," he returned, "requires diligent ponderation. If they think it sufficient that the words of this Confession be recited, God abhorreth such as confess him in words and their heart is far from him, Matt. xv. 8. Nor is Catechizing instituted to this end, that they should answer in words only that they believe in God and will keep his commandments. The Lord saith, 'Teach them to observe and do, Matt. xxviii. 20, and not, only to speak; and He requireth such worshippers as worship him 'in spirit and in truth,' John iv. 23, 24. But if a true confession of faith, and profession of obedience, such as should be required of *adulti*, grown persons, unto baptism, be meant; such a confession of faith must be required as may be judged not to be born in the mouth, or gotten only by human teaching, but also it must have those signs in the life and manners that it ought to be received of the churches as coming from a heart truly believing the Gospel, and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. For though the church cannot look into the hearts of men, yet they ought to judge of trees by their fruits."^b

Chap. iii. Concerning the "formal cause," this holy society, the church of Christ, arises from the coadunion or knitting together of many saints into one by a holy covenant whereby they "as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house," 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5. Though a church-covenant be common to all churches, in its general nature; yet there is a special combination, which gives a peculiar being to one congregational-church and its members distinct from all others: else how could one church have that power over its own members which another hath not? "Some think that the children of confederates are so complete members that they should be excommunicated in case of demerit. I cannot easily assent thereunto; for that would imply that they have an immediate right in all church-privileges, which I do not grant nor believe; but that as the church looks upon them *tanquam in lumbis parentum*, so also if the grown members of the church observe vicious qualities and practices in them, they do not deal with them immediately in those steps of proceeding required in Matt. xviii. to bring matters to the church; but they deal with their parents to discharge their duty in educating their children according to the rule in Eph. vi. 4. To this sense Dr. Ames applieth that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14.^c Nor may their children be baptized till [who] themselves have

^a Tertul. De Pœnit. cap. vi., et Præscrip. advers. Hæret. cap. iv. Cyprian, Lib. iii. ep. 17.

^b Censura Bucer, super. lib. Ordin. Eccles. cap. xvii.

^c Medulla Theol. lib. i. cap. xxxii. sect. 12, 13.

[not] taken hold of the covenant with the church in their own right. For the children of church-members, when they come to age, for not taking hold of the covenant with the church do become non-members and are so to be looked at by the church, if they desert church-fellowship—either departing from them in place, as Esau into mount Seir, or withdrawing from their communion—or if the church withdraw from them. In such cases, they are not so much as implicitly members. Therefore their children may not be baptized. For the right that infants have unto baptism, is in their next and immediate parents, because the apostle in 1 Cor. vii. 14, doth so limit it; because the apostacy of the next parents takes off the federal holiness of their seed, as we see in the posterity of Ishmael and Esau; because if infants should have this right in their grandfathers, where shall we stop? Shall it be extended to a thousand generations, as some misapply that promise in Exod. xx. 6: that cannot be true; for then the children of the Jews and Turks, and heathen, all the world over have a right to baptism in some of their ancestors within that time, contrary to Rom. xi. 17."

Chap. iv. Treating herein of the "quantity and compass of a christian church," Davenport remarks upon the form of the verb *οικοδομήσω*, I will build; Matt. xvi. 18. "Though Christ," he says, "was in all ages the builder of the church, yet he thus speaketh of the church under the New Testament because it was to be constituted after his death... And because all nations could not be joined together in one visible church,... the Lord Jesus instituted a Congregational church among Christians, and invested every such church with sufficient church-power within itself for attainment of all the ends of church communion; this is the church which Christ saith he will build; and appropriates it to himself, 'my church!'" Having instanced other applications of "this title, of 'church,'" he adds, "sometimes it signifieth a definite particular congregation," 1 Cor. xi. 18, 20, and xiv. 23; and in that acceptation it notes sometimes the brethren as distinguished from the elders, Acts xv. 22; sometimes the elders and brethren assembled together, as in 1 Cor. xi. 20; but never the elders meeting apart from the brethren. But in this place [in Matt.] it doth not signify a [any] particular definite church: for there is no particular christian church built by Christ more, or rather, than another. It remaineth, that Christ speaks of a particular congregational church here, in an indefinite sense. And so the word 'church' is applied in the New Testament, when Paul saith he persecuted 'the church,' Phil. iii. 6; not that at Jerusalem only, or Damascus, but all 'the churches in Judea,' Gal. i. 22, 23. In this sense, Christ calls every christian congregational church thus built, 'his church.' From the words thus opened, this doctrinal conclusion is to be collected, namely, That it is the will and appointment of Jesus Christ, that the christian church under the New Testament be in respect of its quantity and compass, Congregational." His first corollary from the whole premises, is, "Then, the Congregational frame of a christian church, is no human invention or constitution." The "parish frame," enjoining all "to communicate at the Lord's table, at least at Easter, is merely human; not being measured by the 'golden reed,' which is the church 'measure,' but by the 'court' measure, Rev. xi. 1, 2."

Chap. v. Concerning "the church's impregnable stability," is summed up in a corollary, that "They that would have a particular church to be impregnable, stable, and firm against the prevailing of 'the gates of hell,' must see that it be built upon this 'Rock,' and not upon human forms. That Christ himself be the builder of it according to his own institutions; not the policies or customs of men!"

Chap. vi. This long chapter or rather "branch or part of the charter" comprises the whole remainder of the discussion, in treating on "the power" given by Christ to particular visible churches, derived from the 19th verse of Matt. xvi. It is herein that Paget is specially encountered. We pass on, at once, to p. 99, "The confirmation or proof that such a church is the first and proper subject of this power, shall be double—by Scripture; by Reasons. By Scripture... this in hand clearly confirmeth it... The 'keys' are all instituted means, whereby an entrance into Christ and his kingdom, visibly, is opened and shut; the subordinate power whereof is here given to the church immediately. The second text is Matt. xviii. 17, 18: this cannot be meant of elders.. acting apart from the brethren, for no such assembly is called 'the church' in the New Testament... The third text is in 1 Cor. v. 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, with 2 Cor. ii. 6... That whole church was no larger than was wont to meet together in one place, 1 Cor. xiv. 23... By

Reasons : because in such a congregational church, are all the causes of this power ; efficient ; .. material ; .. formal . . . There is no former subject of this power from whence a congregational church might derive it ; but it is communicated by means of the church to all that partake of it, and it remaineth in the church when others are removed . . . Their admitting members is an act of this power : . . . Acts ix. 26 ; x. 47. Their choosing officers, is an act of this power : . . . Acts vi. 3, 5 ; xiv. 23. This power, Cyprian acknowledged to be in the People principally, to accept or refuse ministers, Lib. i. ep. 4. Their ordination of officers, by deputing some chosen out of their own body thereunto—in the want of officers—is an act of this power of the keys residing in them . . . Their expostulating with any member, in case of supposed offence, is an act of this power, whereunto Peter submitted, Acts xi. 2—4. . . Their excommunicating obstinate and scandalous sinners, whether a brother, Matt. xviii. 18 ; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5 ; or an officer, Gal. v. 12 ; is an act of this power in the church. Their receiving again, or releasing from censure, those that have been under censure, upon repentance, according to the rule, 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, is an act of this power. This also Cyprian acknowledged to be in the People, or fraternity, Lib. i. ep. 3.” Davenport has several corollaries hereupon, “ Then, the church is before its officers : . . then, though the church hath its essential being and power, without officers, yet it is defective in respect [that] it hath not its complete integrity of members without them ; . . so also, in its operations . . . A church wanting officers, may appoint some of their members to declare the mind of Christ touching the admission of such into the fellowship of the covenant, and membership with the church ; . . and in ordaining officers, chosen by the church, by imposition of hands and prayer ; and in gathering the suffrages of the fraternity ; and in declaring the judgment of the church in censures : but these things they do only at the appointment of the church, *pro hac vel illa vice*. The same things are done by Teaching and Ruling Elders in another manner ; namely, by virtue of their office ; . . for it belongs to them as officers to attend unto their work ; not only to hold forth the covenant, and to receive into fellowship, in the name of the church, those whom the church approveth, but also to try the fitness of those that offer themselves unto fellowship, before they propound them unto the church. The same holds in officers to be called ; and when the church hath chosen them and agreed to ordain them, the Eldership impose hands upon them in the presence of the church, by virtue of their office. When offences are brought, . . if they neglect to bring it [them] to the church, or assume any undue power to themselves ; they that are offended, may complain to the church . . and [but] in the close, they [the Elders] propound the sentence—wherein the church consenteth—authoritatively. Then,” he says, in another corollary, “ the proper acts of church-power, and of ordinary office-power, are limited by the ordinance of Christ, to be put forth by the church and officers respectively within that body or particular congregation to which they have a particular memberly or official relation . . .” Again : “ then, churches gathered and officers ordained in these days, without apostles, are true churches and true church officers according to Christ . . . He doth not say, upon this Rock *my apostles* shall build my church ; and to my church built by *them* I will give the keys . . . After James was beheaded, Acts xii. 2, no apostle was chosen to succeed him, though the apostles lived long after. The apostle John . . describeth . . all the officers that should be . . after that age, under four sorts of living creatures, Rev. iv. 1, 6, 7 ; which note the four sorts of ordinary officers to continue in the church ; . . pastors, teachers, ruling elders, and deacons.”

Taking now, p. 116, upon the 19th verse of Matt. xvi., “ These words,” he affirms, “ hold forth the ratification of Christ’s grant of the keys unto a Congregational Church : . . and that this is spoken to Peter in the name of such a Church, . . is clear from chap. xviii. 18, where the same promise is given by name to such a church, ver. 17. . . The inferior courts in Israel, stood under the highest synedrion ; but there is no such supreme court ordained by Christ over particular churches . . The absolute supremacy of power is in Christ ; that which the Church hath, is only delegated from Christ . . God hath joined entireness of jurisdiction, in *re propria*, to a particular church ; who then shall sunder it from such a church to place it in classes, as superior judicatories, where God never put it ? . . If the first church in a continent had this complete power within itself, before other churches were gathered ; and the rising up of other churches there, long after, should deprive them of it, by setting up a classis as a superior jurisdiction over them ; then, the

neighbourhood of churches should not be a benefit, but a disadvantage to them, and would give them cause to complain unto God, 'Thou hast multiplied the nation, but not increased our joy! Isai. ix. 3.' His first corollary from these premises is, "Then, the censure of excommunication is not a light matter, but to be looked at as very weighty and formidable. It is the sovereign remedy prescribed by Christ against the many diseases whereunto the body is subject; the great preservative of the church's peace and safety against 'the gates of hell.'.. Secondly,—If the church want sufficient light, or consent, for the sentence; they are to seek helps from others by their light and counsel, but still preserving the power of censure entirely in the church, where Christ hath placed it."

To refute an alleged objection in p. 136, that "The church cannot censure their elders, for that were to rule their rulers and to judge their judges; nor will they [the church] censure themselves; but a classis, or synod of many elders, may and will reform all by judicially censuring all:" Davenport answers, "This argument is built upon a mistake or error in the foundation of it; for the rule prescribed in Matt. xviii. is not for removal of all offences, but of such private and less heinous offences as grow public and notorious only by the obstinacy of the delinquent. For if offences be public and heinous in themselves, 1 Cor. v. 11; Rev. xxii. 15, the Apostle doth not direct churches to proceed by those steps. Nor doth it make the people rulers of their rulers, or judges of their judges, when we say that the church hath a power over them in case of delinquency. For excommunication is not an act of the highest rule or authority, but of the highest judgment; and, therefore, the power of it may well be in the whole church as their privilege; without any intrenchment upon the rule and authority of elders, wherein, as officers, they are above the brethren, while they act according to rule; but if they become delinquents, then, as members they are under the power of the whole... They must submit to the church, questioning, or proceeding to censure them with good advice of neighbour churches and elders; who, as they concurred in giving them the right hand of fellowship in their ordination, so they should concur in approving this censure as justly inflicted by the church, from parity of reason... This plaister hinders the healing of the sores of churches: for if a delinquent disliking the church's proceeding, appeals from the sentence of the church to the classis; and, for the same reason, from the sentence of the classis to a provincial synod; then, to a national synod; then, to an œumenical council, which may not assemble in an age: while the appeal depends, he shall stand as uncensured, for this is the law of appeals. Now, how can that heal which is cross to the prescription of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only wise Physician? He saith, 'Tell the church;' and 'if he neglect to hear the church, let him be, etc.' But he who appeals from the church, doth not 'hear the church!..'"

As another, or third, corollary, he proceeds, "Then, entireness of church-government in a particular church completed with its officers, in re propria, will well consist with that communion of churches which the Scripture establisheth... in a way of brotherly association for mutual helpfulness;.. but not in way of subordination or subjection of one church to the ecclesiastical government, whether of another church or of the elders of several churches assembled in classes or synods." Still further, he adds, p. 154, "Then, entireness of church government in a particular congregation, in re propria, ought to be thankfully received, rightly improved, and faithfully preserved without violation of it, both by the members of particular churches and by other churches and their officers." We conclude with an admonition, p. 178, "In some cases, a mischief is to be chosen before an inconvenience; as lawyers speak. Better it is that the church want a remedy for a case that may not happen in a man's life, than to be under the continual droppings of classical-jurisdiction over them in all cases!"

Among the public occurrences of this year, 1640-1, it behoves us not to overlook what most nearly concerns the denomination in which we are professedly interested. We take the particulars from the Journals of the House of Lords,^a where, however, as will be seen, the word "Anabaptists" is a clerical error.

^a Vol. iv. p. 133.

“ 16. Car. Die Sabbati, *videlicet*, 16^o die Januarii. A. D. 1640-1.

Anabaptists recommended to the justice of this House by his Majesty.

The Lord Privy Seal, by command from his Majesty, presented to the House a Paper, .. which he commended to the justice and care of the House to consider of. The Contents of the Paper were read, *in hæc verba*—

Decimo tertio Die Januarii, 1640-1.

Edm. Chillendon,
Nic. Tyne,
John Webb,
Richard Sturges,
Thomas Gunn,
Jo. Ellis,

They were all taken on Sunday last, in the afternoon, in the time of Divine Service, by the Constables and Church-wardens of St. Saviour's, in the house of Richard Sturges; where they said they met to teach and edify one another in Christ.

With at least sixty people more.

1. They being brought before Sir John Lenthall, he demanded *Their Tenets.* why they would not go and resort to their Parish Church, according to the Law of the 35th Eliz. They answered, That the 35th Eliz. was not a true Law, for that it was made by the Bishops; and that they would not obey it.

2. That they would not go to their Parish Churches: That those Churches were not true Churches; and that there was no true Church, but where the Faithful met.

3. That the King could not make a perfect Law, for he was not a perfect man.

4. That they ought not to obey him but in Civil things.^a

5. That some of them threatened the Church-wardens and Constables, that they had not yet answered for this day's work.

John Lenthall,
Tho. Temple,

Tho. Butler, Church-warden.
John Luntley.

Hereupon it was ordered, That Sir. Jo. Lenthall do take care the aforesaid persons shall be forthcoming, and appear before this House on Monday morning next; and likewise, that he cause the constable, the church-wardens, and whosoever else can testify any thing in the business, to attend the same time here.

Upon this occasion the House thought fit, and ordered, This order following should be read publicly in all the parish churches of London and Westminster, the borough of Southwark, and the liberties and suburbs of them:

That the divine service be performed as it is appointed by the Acts of Parliament of this realm; and that all such as shall disturb that wholesome order, shall be severely punished, according to law; and that the parsons, vicars, and curates, in several parishes, shall forbear to introduce any rites or ceremonies that may give offence, otherwise than those which are established by the laws of the land.

Die Lunæ, videlicet 18^o die Januarii.

The Lord Privy Seal, Earl Marshal, and Lord Chamberlain, gave the House thanks from his Majesty, for the course they had taken concerning the Sectaries.

And Edmond Chillendon, Nics. Tyne, John Webb, Richard Sturges, Tho. Gunn, Jo. Ellis, being brought by order of this House, were severally called in, all of them denying the material things which they were charged with. Hereupon, Sir Jo. Lenthall, Tho. Temple, Tho. Butler, and John Luntley were sworn; and upon their oath, did justify that what was contained and subscribed by them, in the paper delivered, was true.

Thereupon the House did order, That the said sectaries should receive for this time an admonition from this House, that they shall hereafter repair to their several parish churches, to hear divine service, and to give obedience thereunto, according to the acts of parliament of this realm; to that purpose the order was read unto them, made by this House the 16th of January; and to be told that, if hereafter they do not observe these commands, they shall be severely punished, according to law.”

On the surface of what is here recorded, there is something that demands explanation, and we are able to supply it on such authority as adds to the interest of the narrative. According then, to Crosby, the

^a “The king hath no more power over the Church, than the boy who rubs my horse-heels:” Dr. Cosins, Dean of Peterborough. See Rushworth, Mar. 15, 1640-1; Pt. iii. vol. i. p. 209.

author of a History of the English Baptists, 1738, who possessed a manuscript which was probably written between 1639 and 1644, or at furthest 1653, and which he calls "an abstract of this Church's Journal,"^a which he says, in the same page, he had lent Mr. Neal; "this is a very imperfect and partial account of this matter, as appears by the Church-book, or Journal, kept by this people. It was not an 'Anabaptist,' but an Independent Congregation, though there might be some few among them holding that opinion. They met at Deadman's-Place, having at that time one Mr. Stephen More for their pastor; and being assembled on the Lord's-day, for religious worship as usual, though not with their former secrecy, they were discovered and taken, and by Sir John Lenthall, the marshal of the King's bench, committed to the Clink prison." He adds, "The Lords examined them strictly concerning their principles; and they as freely acknowledged, that they owned no other Head of the Church but Christ Jesus; that no Prince had power to make laws to bind the consciences of men; and, that laws made contrary to the Law of God were of no force." Again, he adds, "As things now stood, the Lords could by no means discountenance these principles; and, therefore, instead of inflicting any penalty, they treated them with a great deal of respect and civility. And some of the House inquired where the place of their meeting was, and intimated that they would come and hear them. And accordingly, three or four of the Peers did go on the Lord's day following, to the great surprise and wonder of many. The people went on in their usual method, having two sermons; in both of which they treated of those principles for which they had been accused, grounding their discourses on the words of our Saviour, 'All power is given unto me in heaven, and in earth.'^b After this they received the Lord's Supper, and then made a collection for the poor; to which the Lords contributed liberally with them; and at their departure, signified their satisfaction in what they had heard and seen, and their inclination to come again. But this made too much noise, and gave too great an alarm to the mob, for them to venture a second time. And, perhaps, this was the first Dissenting Meeting that ever had so great an honour done it."^c

Fuller calls this affair, "the first fruits of Anabaptistical insolence," and says, "they confessed the articles, but no penalty was inflicted on them."^d And Neal represents More to have been "a citizen of London, of good natural parts, and of considerable substance in the world. He had been their Deacon for some years, and in the present exigency accepted of the pastoral office, to the apparent hazard of his life and liberty. However, the face of affairs beginning now to change, this poor Congregation, which had subsisted almost by a miracle for above twenty-four years, ventured to open their doors in Deadman's-Place, in Southwark."^e

It is worthy of notice, that all the relators of this anecdote give its date January the 18th, but the extract from the Lords' Journals cannot be disputed.

^a Vol. iii. p. 40.^b Matt. xxviii, 18.^c P. 161—163.^d Church Hist. 1655. bk. xi. p. 172.^e Hist. Purit. vol. i. ch. vi.

Deadman's Place is now known as a Burial-ground lately disused, adjoining westward to the Park-street end of Red Cross-street, and not far north of Castle-street, so that if an imaginary line be continued from Worcester-street, and another be imagined to cross that, at right angles, about sixty yards northward of Castle-street, their intersection would mark the location. See "An Historical Research concerning the most ancient Congregational Church in England; showing the claim of the Church worshipping in Union-street, Southwark, to that distinction. By B. Hanbury. 1820." 8vo. pp. 54.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

THE COMMONS' PROTESTATION.—BURTON.—GEREE.—ANONYMOUS.

THE court-intriguers, with other partizans of the "thorough"^a acting Earl of Strafford, were discovered to be plotting to raise forces, under the pretext of their being for the service of Portugal, but really to overawe the Parliament; in the "progress" of which and their other designs, it is admitted by the historian of the "Rebellion," that "there sometimes happened strange accidents for the confirmation of their credit!"^b The principal of them, whom Clarendon styles "such eminent men," finding that "what had passed so privately and amongst themselves, had been discovered, . . . fled into France."^c Advantage was consequently taken to defeat the plot, whatever it might be; and on May 3rd, 1641, Mr. Pym assured the House of Commons, that "God had miraculously preserved them from a most prodigious conspiracy;" and added, "that though this attempt was disappointed, yet he feared there might be some new device; and, therefore, he proposed . . . that some Protestation might be entered into . . . for the defence of their privileges and the performance of those duties to God and the king, which they were obliged to as good Christians and good subjects." A committee was resolved upon, and the prerogative party named "such persons as were not like to submit to any unlawful or inconvenient obligation." The doors were locked, and after a long debate, the words being settled, and the form agreed upon, the Speaker and all the members present solemnly for themselves acceded to it. The Lords "all likewise took the same,"^d except two, who alleged that no law enjoined it, and that "such voluntary engagements might produce effects that were not then intended." Some, of either house, took covert refuge under the obligation to maintain and defend the "Protestant religion expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England;" which they construed to mean the Thirty-nine Articles, of which one is, to preserve the government of the Church by "Bishops!"^e This subterfuge drove the Commons, two days after, "without any great opposition," to evade it in an explanatory ordinance; passed, if Clarendon may be believed, without "advising with the House of Peers." The Commons

^a The league term, between Laud and Strafford.

^b Clarendon, bk. iii. p. 249.

^c *Ibid.* p. 250. "It is true," he says, "there had been some idle discourses, in a tavern, between some officers, about raising men for Portugal."

^d "The Bishops have put their hands to it; and we like it all the worse."—Baillie, vol. i. let. 28, p. 295.

^e "For which cause divers of the best refuse to subscribe, *in the city*." Baillie, *ib.*

ordered further, that the Protestation together with the Explanation should be printed and published: and that the members should intimate to "the people, with what willingness all the members of that House made that Protestation; and that... they could not but approve it in all such as should take it." And the historian adds, "The emissaries of their clergy caused the same to be taken in London and the parts adjacent, within very few days after the publishing;" but to "compel all the subjects" to take it, a bill was sent up to the Lords: "what the success of that bill was, and what use was afterward made of this Protestation... shall be remembered in its proper place."^a

Whether, or not, Henry Burton may be esteemed, agreeably to what we have just seen, one of "their clergy," certain it is that he quickly produced a tract of twenty-one pages, with the title of "The Protestation Protested: or, A Short Remonstrance, showing what is principally required of all those that have or do take the last Parliamentary Protestation.—Eccles. v. 4, 5.—1641." 4to. Some additional interest attaches to this piece from Richard Baxter having remarked that "till Mr. Ball wrote in favour of the Liturgy, and against Canne, Allin, etc., and till Mr. Burton published his 'Protestation Protested,' I never thought what Presbytery or Independency was, nor ever spake with a man who seemed to know it."^b Burton's argument is inconveniently conducted by alternate paragraphs of "Objection" and "Answer," and it commences thus:—

"WHEN in the scale of conscience rightly informed, I weigh the words of the 'Protestation' and of this exhortation of the Holy Ghost

^a Clar. p. 251—254. The Protestation is in this form: "I A. B. do, in the presence of Almighty God, promise, vow, and protest, to maintain and defend, as far as lawfully I may, with my life, power, and estate, the true Reformed Protestant religion, expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England, against all Popery and popish Innovations within this Realm, contrary to the same doctrine; and, according to the duty of my allegiance, I will maintain and defend his Majesty's royal person, honour, and estate; also, the power and privileges of Parliaments; the lawful rights and liberties of the Subjects; and every Person that maketh this Protestation, in whatsoever he shall do in the lawful pursuance of the same: And to my power, and as far as I lawfully may, I will oppose, and, by all good ways and means, endeavour to bring condign punishment on all such as shall by force, practice, counsels, plots, conspiracies, or otherwise, do anything to the contrary of anything in this present Protestation contained: And further, that I shall, in all just and honourable ways, endeavour to preserve the union and peace betwixt the three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and neither for hope, fear, nor other respects, shall relinquish this promise, vow, and Protestation." The Explanation runs thus: "Whereas some doubts have been raised, by several persons out of this House, concerning the meaning of these words contained in the Protestation lately made by the Members of this House, viz. 'The true Reformed Protestant religion, expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England, against all Popery and popish Innovations within this Realm, contrary to the same doctrine:' This House doth declare, That by those words was and is meant only the Public Doctrine professed in the said Church, so far as it is opposite to Popery and popish Innovations; and that the said words are not to be extended to the maintaining of any Form of worship, discipline, or government, nor of any rites, or ceremonies, of the said Church of England." July 30th, the House Resolved and Declared, "That what person soever shall not take the Protestation is unfit to bear office in the Church or Commonwealth." Clarendon's text is corrected by Rushworth's, vol. iv. p. 241.

^b True Hist. of Councils Enlarged, &c. 1632." 4to. p. 91.

together, Eccles. v. 4, 5, I cannot but tremble when I see what small account most men do make of so solemn a 'vow' as they so solemnly take upon them in the said 'Protestation:' for when ministers and people have . . . solemnly vowed 'to maintain' the doctrine of our Church so far as it is opposite to 'Popery,' do they, withal, presently set upon the performance? . . . Do they not further 'defer' to pay it? Surely if they do defer it, the Holy Ghost calls them 'fools' in whom God hath 'no pleasure!' . . .

"Object.—But how do they defer? . . .

"Ans.—In that they do not presently renounce and 'protest' against 'all Popery.' . . .

"Ob.—'Why!'—will they say—'what communion have we Protestants with Popery? We do all renounce it.'

"An.—In words we do : . . but indeed we retain it, and have close communion with it. . .

"Ob.—But what Popery do we Protestants of the Church of England retain? . . .

"An.—We hold communion with Popery so long as we do publicly retain and maintain any of the doctrines of Popery. . . 1. The imposition of the Liturgy : 2. The discipline : 3. The government : 4. The ceremonies.

"Ob.—But all these being, as yet, established by law, we may not cast them off till the law which set them up be abrogated : . . and we 'protest' against Popery, to cast it out 'as far as lawfully' we may, and no otherwise.

"An.—First ; All laws are to be interpreted according to their clear intention and end : now the law for Reformation never intended to allow, or set up, Popery, in this Church of England. Secondly ; If any human laws be found contrary to God's Word, they are invalid and void ipso facto ; and it will appear that Imposition of a devised Liturgy, human rites and ceremonies, prelatical government and discipline, are directly contrary to God's Word. Thirdly ; Having once made this solemn 'Protestation' . . . and finding that the particulars aforesaid are branches of 'Popery,' we are bound, ipso facto, forthwith to have no more communion with them. . .

"Ob.—But what if the Parliament did not intend, or understand, by 'Popery,' the foresaid things? . . . Shall we presume to extend the sense of the 'Protestation' further than the first makers thereof intended? And, the Prelates—we presume—would never so readily, have subscribed . . . had they dreamed any such sense to lie hid . . . as their hierarchy, with their liturgy, rites, etc. ; for then they had, in the 'Protestation,' protested against all these ; and should have given their hands and votes, for the rooting of them out of this Church !

"An.—First ; This we are sure of, . . . That they intended it 'against all Popery.' Secondly ; They express themselves, and profess, thus far, That the words of the Protestation 'are not to be extended to the maintaining of any form of worship, discipline, etc., in the said Church of England :' *ergo*, We do not, we may not, 'protest' for the maintenance of these. Thirdly ; Suppose that, at the first making of the 'Protestation' in the Parliament, these particulars . . . were not reckoned

in the catalogue of 'all Popery:' yet no good Christian will or can deny that the Honourable House of Commons did not at all intend to exclude whatever should be found to pertain to 'Popery' as a branch thereof. And therefore, we may boldly conclude, that if the forementioned things shall be found to be—and that, no small branches of—'Popery,' the 'Protestation' hath an edge to cut them off all at one stroke! Fourthly; We are all in an erected hope of such a Reformation intended, by this noble Parliament, as cannot justly challenge the name of Reformation, unless 'all Popery' be made to be packing; which, of necessity, must carry with her all trinkets and baggage, with all her pompous equipage; among whose sumpters, the Hierarchy with all its *pontificalibus* of service, ceremonies, discipline, train, courts, may challenge to go in the foremost rank. Fifthly, and lastly; Suppose it could be supposed, by any rational man, that the House of Commons could have no such thought as implicitly to include the aforesaid particulars in the fardel of 'Popery;' or, that they could not possibly intend the maintaining of those things still of which they expressly say that the 'words' of the 'Protestation' are 'not to be extended to the maintaining of any Form of worship, discipline, etc. ;' or, that these things should not be removed; . . . what then? Shall private and particular Christians, knowing these things to be 'Popery' and antichristian, being also bound by their solemn vow, . . . never reform themselves until they see a general reformation over the whole land? . . . Will they, against their conscience, . . . live and die votaries and communicants in that Service; schoolboys and punies under the ferula of that 'discipline;' vassals under that 'government;' conformists to those 'rites' and 'ceremonies;' all which are very 'Popery,' and 'popish Innovations'?

"Ob.—But how doth it appear that the forementioned particulars are branches of 'Popery'?

"An.— . . Now most clear it is, by the Scripture, that the Liturgy, discipline, etc., of the Church of England, are all of them so many branches of 'Popery.' . . First, For the Liturgy: this is a branch . . in two general respects: first, in regard of the whole frame and matter of it, as being translated out of the Romish Latin Liturgy; as is confessed in the 'Book of Martyrs:' see for this, the late 'Parallel between the English Liturgy and the Mass-book.' I omit to say anything here, of the many vicious particulars throughout the Service-book, which run, as the corrupt blood, through all the veins of it. . . The second general, is the Imposition of it, upon all men's consciences. . . Were the Liturgy, in itself, never so free from other faults, yet, being a service of men's devising, the Imposition, I say, makes it a branch of 'Popery;' . . an opposing and overthrowing of Christ's kingly office: . . an office, incommunicable to any creature, or power, in heaven or earth. . . This is that 'will worship,' . . expressly condemned, and branded as the highest tyranny; which to be 'subject unto,' is the spoiling and cheating men of their salvation, as we read at large, Colos. ii. 8—18; and a separating us from our 'Head' and King, Christ, *ver.* 19; and an evacuating of his death, *ver.* 20. . . Thus it is as plain as brief, that the Imposing of a Liturgy of man's devising, upon the conscience, is the pretended

service of God:—... it is rather, the service of man; and which God condemneth, as a 'vain' worship of Him, Matt. xv. 9... Secondly; For Ceremonies of man's devising, in the worship of God, and imposed upon the conscience; these... are by the same reasons as before, proved to be 'Popery.' Thirdly; For Discipline,—which stands chiefly, in correction of manners, and inflicting of censures, as excommunication, such as is, and hath been, exercised in the Church of England ever since the pretended Reformation in this point;—that this is also another main branch of 'Popery,' do but compare it with that Discipline in the Church of Rome, and you shall find it, in all points, so jump and agree, as you must of necessity conclude, if Rome's Discipline be 'Popery' then, certainly, our English Discipline is 'Popery' too!... And so our Church wanting the true Discipline, which ought to be one of the three marks of a visible true Church—as it is noted in our Homilies,—the Church of England wants this mark at the least. And, if the Sacraments be not 'duly administered;' as being mixed and corrupted with a service of man's devising, and ministered pell-mell—as in the Lord's Supper—to ignorant and profane persons: then, for aught I see, it wants a second mark of a visible true Church. And if—as lately, and in many places still—the Word of God, in the preaching of it, be generally corrupted; as when the full and free liberty of it, in sundry points of evangelical truth, is restrained and prohibited, by orders and edicts not yet called in:... by this reckoning, it should want the third mark! and so much the more, in case the Calling of the ministry itself, should prove a piece of 'Popery' too. But this by the way, only it leads us the way to the next point... Fourthly, then; For the Government of the Church of England, by Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, Deans, Commissaries, Officials, and the rest of that fraternity; if this be not 'Popery,' yea, and a top branch of it, I know not what is! Sure we are, not any one of all this rabble is found to be in the Scripture; and therefore, of Divine Institution, this Government is not; and, consequently, Christian it is not: it must needs then, be of Antichrist's Order, and Papal merely!... If we look... from Canterbury to Carlisle; and go through all their courts, their officers, their offices and administrations therein; we shall behold the perfect 'image' of the Papal 'beast' from horn to hoof. And if any will object, here, that the subordinate ministers bear a part in this Government, alas! that is but a mere mockery: for these are but the Prelates' *Curates*—a company of Priests, little differing from Rome's order of priesthood, in the estimate of our Prelates; saving that they are not shaven, and have, of late, been prevented of [from] being sacrificers:—but a part in the hierarchical government, they have none; unless a dumb Priest commonly, or some Doctor, now and then, be the mouth, to thunder out excommunication in their Courts; which the poor Curate, at the Commissary's beck, must publish in the congregation. And, to these Curates' consideration, I refer it, whether they be able, truly, out of good premises, to conclude themselves to be the ministers of Christ lawfully called? when all of them do immediately derive their ministry from the antichristian hierarchy, or Papal Prelacy... If here, it be objected, That the Government of Archbishops and Diocesan Bishops was before Popery came up;

.. I answer, first, that the [that] Government.. was, anciently, much different from the Papal hierarchical government afterwards; whose courts, and sole prelatical jurisdiction, were not known in the Primitive Ages, long after the Apostles: secondly; the [that] Government.. at the very best, and when they first sprung up, was, even from the well-head, corrupted; as being a human device, and the first spring of 'the mystery of iniquity' which, the further it ran, the more corrupt it grew, till it had its full confluence in muddy Tiber—the See of Rome—by whose inundation Antichrist having hoisted up his mainsails, could easily compass—in the whole Eastern Christian world: thirdly, the Hierarchical Government in England, as a main arm of that sea, so it hath altered nothing of its former property when it was a limb of the Papacy; saving, that before the Reformation, they held immediately from the Pope, and now,—especially of later days,—they hold by the same false, pretended, title which the Pope himself holds by; namely, from Christ, and by Divine authority! Witness, Dr. Hall's sweaty [laboured] discourses.^a And Dr. Pocklington shows us a brief pedigree of the present titular Archbishop of Canterbury; saying, 'Miserable men were we, if he that now sitteth Archbishop of Canterbury could not derive his succession from St. Augustine, St. Augustine from St. Gregory, St. Gregory from St. Peter.' So be: only here he fails, and so becomes 'miserable,' that though he can prove Canterbury's succession from Rome, yet never Rome's from Peter. And so, a several *misery* follows upon it, That our Hierarchical Government being a limb of the Papal, and so a top branch, it is now, universally, of all good Christians in England PROTESTED against, as worthy to be cut off and cast out as a fruitless, withering, branch; and to be plucked up by the roots, as a tree twice dead, and as a plant not of God's planting!

"Ob.—But if it be thus:.. [what shall be] instead thereof?"

"An.—I answer briefly, First; Understanding the Church of England to be none other than a National Church, it will be very difficult, if not rather impossible, to constitute it so as is agreeable, in all points, to a true and visible Congregation of Christ: for a Particular Church, or Congregation, rightly collected and constituted, consists of none but such as are visible living members of Christ the Head, and visible saints under Him, the one and only King of Saints; but so is it not with a National Church!.. In.. this, which hath been so universally overspread with profaneness and darkness; so long beslaved under the yoke of prelatical tyranny, .. formal service, will-worship, universal false and loose discipline, innumerable either false, or unprofitable, or idle teachers—non-residents, 'dumb dogs;'^b—so as whole counties for want of good ministers who have been, every where, cast out, .. —yea, the whole land in comparison,—are overgrown with .. those that know not what true religion means; where shall we begin to reform?.. Surely, in the new forming of a Church such as God requireth in his Word, Christ's voice must first be heard, to call forth his sheep and to gather them into their flocks and folds: for ἐκκλησία, the church, is properly a congregation of believers, called out from the rest of the world; for

^a "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted. 1640." 4to.

^b Isa. lvi. 10.

so saith the Lord, 2 Cor. vi. 17: a strange speech, 'and be ye separate!' . . . In a corrupt Church,—as this is, . . . by reason of the great apostacy, and especially the wickedness of the Prelates,—we should do as the Apostles did when they came to plant churches . . . where the Gospel had not been formerly preached: first, they taught the people; and then, those which heard and believed were formed into a church or congregation. But here are, blessed be God! many people already fitted to make up holy assemblies or churches. Well then, let it be the first degree of Reformation, to begin and call forth all those into several congregations, who are fitted and who desire to draw near to Christ in a holy communion with Him in the purity of his ordinances. And thus let God's Word run and have a free passage. . . . Nor can we think, at the first especially, that every assembly of people collected in their several parishes, is fit to make up a Congregation, and so qualified as Christ requireth; for how many parishes in England will be found where scarce one is able to give 'a reason of the hope'^a that is in him!

"Ob.—But shall not good preachers be set up in every parish, that the people may be instructed; and so fitted to be members of a Congregation such as afore is mentioned?

"An.—No doubt of that; so far as is possible to provide preachers.

"Ob.—But what shall the people do, in the mean time; . . . have they not received baptism? are they not Christians? shall they not, then, be admitted in to the communion of the other sacrament?

"An.—. . . The 'lame' or the 'blind,' is not to be offered up in 'sacrifice.'^b

"Ob.—But admit that such as are ordinary profane persons, . . . be admitted to the Sacrament pell-mell; may not godly persons communicate with them and therein not sin?

"An.—For that, let such as are godly look to it. . . . 'A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump:' the apostle applies it to a *mixt communion*. 'Let us keep the feast,' saith he,—to wit, in participating of 'Christ our passover' in the sacrament,—'not with the old leaven;' and thereupon he tells them, 'I wrote unto you in an epistle, not to company with fornicators;'^c and [in another place], 'This ye know, that no whoremonger, &c., hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ. . . . Be not ye therefore partakers with them.'^d

"Ob.—But if congregations be so mixed as they cannot, or are not secured; shall godly men, for that cause, deprive themselves of the ordinance?

"An.—First; There is no necessity that men in using the ordinance, should sin by communicating with others in the profanation of holy things: secondly; it is not God's ordinance that his holy things should be profaned: 'Cast not your pearls before swine; nor your holy things to dogs.'^e 'Who required this at your hand, to tread my courts?' and yet, their 'oblations,' their 'sabbaths,' their 'solemn assemblies,' were God's ordinances: but because they were polluted and profaned by those that joined in them, therefore the Lord abhors them, 'Wash you, make you clean, &c.'^f

^a 1 Pet. iii. 15.

^b Deut. xv. 21.

^c 1 Cor. v. 6--9

^d Eph. v. 5, 7.

^e Matt. vii. 6.

^f Isa. i. 12, 13, 16.

“Ob.—But what is this, to godly persons communicating with profane?

“An.—To communicate with known evil doers which, even in their presuming to communicate in the ordinances, do evil in their doing of evil, is to ‘partake’ of their evil deeds. Be ‘*not mingled with*’^a such, saith the apostle, that they may ‘be ashamed:’ and, ‘We command you brethren, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, &c.’^b

“Ob.—But if it be so, where can a godly man communicate without sin; for where are not the congregations mixed?

“An.—It is true that, if there be none other congregations allowed but such as are in parishes, this confusion cannot be avoided: therefore, of necessity there must be liberty granted of setting up Churches or Congregations where *Christ’s* ordinances are administered in their purity; and so, where none are admitted members of the congregation but such as are approved of, by the whole assembly...

“Ob.—But would you have other Congregations than such as are limited to every parish? How will this stand with a National Church?... This would make a division and separation.

“An.—We must look, in the first place, [at] what Christ commandeth, etc. If a State will set up a National Church wherein many things, out of reason of State, are tolerated, and prescribed for ‘order’ sake, as they call it; and if there be such a necessity,—necessity hath no law! But let not this, exclude and bar out the free use of such Congregations as whereof the spiritual commonwealth of Israel consisteth; over which, Christ, as King, immediately reigneth by his Spirit and Word, in the beauty and purity of His ordinances. Let not the consciences of God’s people be bound, where Christ hath purchased liberty: and where Christ’s Congregations are set up, however they are separate from the World in the corruptions thereof, yet they are not separate from the Civil State; but are peaceable members thereof, subject and obedient to all good and just laws thereof. Yea, where such Congregations are erected and allowed of by a Civil State, they are both a strength and beauty; and procure many blessings unto it. They are unto a Civil State as that fulminatrix legio, that ‘thundering legion’ in the emperor Antoninus’s *army*—as he called it,—which consisting wholly of Christians... did, by their prayers, procure refreshing showers to the whole army when it was sore distressed with drought; and terrible storms on the other side, to the discomfiture of their enemy.^c And therefore, the Apostle exhorts Christians, to pray ‘for Kings,’ and such as are ‘in authority;’ that ‘we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.’^d And [so] Jeremiah; ‘Pray unto the Lord for the City of your captivity: for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace:’^e implying, [that] it is the duty of Civil Princes and States,—Heathen or Christian,—to protect, or tolerate, the true Christian religion in their kingdoms; as well as of the true Christians and professors, to ‘pray’ for them: for Christ’s Kingdom

^a *μη συναναμίσγυσθε.*

^b 2 Thess. iii. 14, 6.

^c Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. v. cap. 5.

^d 1 Tim. ii. 2.

^e Jer. xxix 7.

being spiritual, is so far from being any prejudice to Civil States, that it is the very glory and safety of them. . .

“Ob.—But that there shall be an order of Church government established, in a National Church; and withal, a liberty left for other Church-assemblies; . . this may be a means to foment factions and envious emulations in a State. . .

“An.—For this; first, there be good laws for civil-government: secondly, that [when] any one, among the exempted Congregations, do incorrigibly [*sic*] misbehave themselves, the law can take order with them: thirdly, let no men blame them before they try them: fourthly, it hath been an old stratagem of Satan still to lay all the blame of whatever disaster upon the Christians, as Nero did! fifthly, it cannot be expected but wherever the Gospel cometh in its power and purity, it will kindle coals and stir up debate, as Christ saith, Matt. x. 21: but this is accidentally. . . And if for this, every Civil State should shut out the true religion, where would there be left any true church upon the earth?

“Ob.—But the church-way of Independency is too strict and cannot be content with a mediocrity, but aspires to such a perfection of purity as men are not capable of; and therefore, such will, of necessity, be envied and maligned, which will cause divisions.

“An.—As if all true Christians were not expected, every where, and so bound, to strive for perfection so much as is possible, as we read, Matt. v. 20, 48; Phil. iii. 12; Col. i. 28; iv. 12; 2 Tim. iii. 17; and every where, in the Scripture, is ‘perfect’ holiness required, as Eph. iv. 12; 2 Cor. vii. 1; see also, Heb. v. 12; vi. 1; etc. And, for envy, were there but once set up, amongst us, some such Congregations as come nearest to the rule of God’s Word, both in church-constitutions and graces suitable, they would draw no less love and liking to them. . . than ever this land hath yet seen. And however the world accounts strictness, yet none are admitted Members thereof, but such as are both willing and desirous, and do freely enter into covenant to observe all the conditions and orders thereof, according to God’s Word: and whoso are over, in, and of, this Congregation, they find in it nothing that is grievous; but Christ’s sweetness, whose ‘yoke is easy,’ and His ‘burden light.’^a

“Ob.—But if such Congregations were set up, . . it would, perhaps, stir up the parochial ministers, or some at least, to envy and malignity: . . and by this means also, should their wages be diminished.

“An.—First; if Christians living in a parish shall find just cause of separating themselves; . . as where great scandals and offences are constantly given; . . shall any ministers be so unchristian as to envy this? Or if they do, let them reform their own congregations and take away all such scandals, . . and set up Christ’s government, . . that so, they may retain those honest souls which, otherwise, are forced to forsake the puddled streams to enjoy the sweet, fresh, and pure ‘fountain of living waters.’^b Nor will the ministers and pastors of such Independent Congregations, look after any such wages as the parochial

^a Matt. xi. 29, 30.

^b Jer. ii. 13.

ministers challenge to themselves, as tithes, or the like. No, surely; they are, and will be, content that such competent maintenance as the Members of their several Congregations respectively shall freely, without any compulsion—as is used in tithes—allow unto them...

“Ob.—But the Parliament now being about a Reformation: . . . what Government shall be set up in this National Church?

“An.—The Lord strengthen and direct the Parliament in so great and glorious a work. . . But as for the manner of Government of a National Church, because it hath no pattern in the Scripture now under the Gospel, who can herein prescribe or advise anything? . . . Let it be what it will [a Presbytery, or otherwise,] so as still a due respect be had to those Congregations and Churches which desire an exemption, and liberty of enjoying Christ's ordinances in such purity as a National Church is not capable of: and, whatever liturgy, or ceremonies, or discipline, are left to accompany this National Church-government, it is indifferent with us, so [that] we may enjoy our Christian liberty in the true use of such ordinances, and of such Independent Church-government, as Christ, the only Law-giver of his Church, and Lord of the conscience, hath left unto us in his Word.

“Ob.—But Independent Churches being absolute in themselves, and exempted from a superior jurisdiction of others; and yet not exempted from possibility of erring; what law is left, to reduce them from their error? . . .

“An.—First; they have Christ's law to regulate them: secondly; they have that law of Christ, which is, by love, to serve one another: they have the law of association and confederation with other churches, to consult, advise, and confer with, in matters of doubt or question: and if, after all other remedies, any be obstinate in his or their error, they are liable to excommunication either in the same Congregation, if it be a particular person and the error great; or from other Churches, if the whole Congregation have offended and do stiffly maintain a dangerous error; which yet is rarely seen in a well-constituted Congregation, consisting of meet members. And if, at any time, such a thing should fall out which cannot grow but from some root of apostacy, particular or general; if the offence do reflect also upon the laws of the Civil State which are made against known heresies, or blasphemy, or idolatry, and the like, the offenders are obnoxious to the Civil power: so little fear there is, that any Independent Congregation, or any member thereof, should be exempt from condign censure, where just cause is given either Ecclesiastical or Civil!”

Burton's project for promoting a real Reformation on grounds totally distinct from State-church policy, roused respective advocates of the existent and pre-existent State-ecclesiastics to assume the attitude of respondents. The Presbyterians were represented in “*Vindiciæ Voti: or, A Vindication of the True Sense of the National Covenant; in a Brief and Moderate Answer to the 'Protestation Protested.' Discovering the Unsoundness of that Interpretation of the Covenant; and the Weakness of the grounds there suggested for separate and Independent Churches.*—By John Gere, M.A., and Preacher of God's Word

in Tewkesbury.—Published by the Authority of the House of Commons. 1641.”^a 4to. pp. 32.

He tells the “Christian Reader” that Burton’s “treatise so far as it doth concern his title, seemed to me so irrational that I thought all understanding Christians would rather have smiled at the weakness than have been any way moved with the sophistry of it: but finding, by experience, that not only many of the more intelligent Christians, but even some of reputation in a higher rank, were much taken with it; and the effect of it, that some were scrupled, some attempted a tumultuous removing of things Established by Law, under colour of this ‘Protestation;’ I thought it necessary that unto this treatise, pressing the taking of the Covenant, . . . I should annex a brief answer to the unsound interpretation of it by this nameless author, lest those that have or may enter into it by any means, be afterwards, by this bad gloss, cast upon either the incomparable burden of a wounded conscience or unwarrantable and illegal actions; which will hinder, not further, a holy, legal, and orderly Reformation.”

The Answer commences thus: “The very title seems to me a riddle, seeing nothing in the treatise to answer it; this being not an avowing but a glossing, or rather a glozing, of the ‘Protestation.’ . . . It is not to be doubted, but many enter this ‘Protestation’ rather for company than conscience, and so will make too little account of keeping it, and need admonition to observe as well as to enter this Covenant: but that this neglect should be so general as to include the generality of the godly, as this Expositor doth make it; that I dare not assent unto. The Psalmist hath taught me more tenderness: ‘If I will speak thus; behold, I should offend against the generation of thy children.’”^b To condemn the godly, was such a thing to this blessed Psalmist, that he would renounce sense and reason, and set upon a serious review, rather than dash upon it: in whose steps had this Author trodden he would not have been so rash [as] to have put the *fool* upon them! . . . But now to the point.

“In his very first argumentation, there is a most palpable fallacy; which is so obvious that it is [a] wonder to me that any man, that would undertake to write a book in a matter of this consequence, should either not himself see, or should imagine that so many clear eyes that it must needs touch, would not most easily discern: . . . for the ‘Protestation’ is not against ‘popery’ absolutely, but, as this Author expresseth it, so far forth as it is against ‘the doctrine of the Church of England:’ what ‘popery’ then, ‘the doctrine’ of the Church of England, doth not condemn, this ‘Protestation’ doth not include. . . . But then some will demand, Is not ‘the doctrine of the Church of England, against all popery?’ I answer, *ad hominem*: If the things here objected be ‘popery;’ then, ‘the doctrine of the Church’ is not against ‘all popery:’ for these things, so far as they may be termed doctrinal, are yet according to ‘the doctrine of the Church of England.’ Unless you

^a Geree had been for some years silenced, by Bishop Goodman; but was restored to his cure in this year, by the Committee of Religion. Wood, Ath. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 245, edit Bliss.

^b Ps. lxxiii. 15.

will say, that 'the doctrine of the Church of England' is contrary to the practice of the Church of England. Whence then, thus I argue: Either 'the doctrine of the Church of England' is not 'against all popery,' or else 'the imposition' of the Liturgy, Ceremonies, Discipline, Government, are not 'popery;' for 'the doctrine of the Church of England' is not 'against' them! If 'the doctrine of the Church of England' is not 'against all popery,' he that vows to 'maintain' that 'doctrine' 'against all popery,' vows not 'against' popery absolutely, but only as it is against that 'doctrine:' and then, this Author's inference from this vow against popery, with this restraint, That we must therefore oppose 'all' popery, absolutely; is a manifest inconsequence. On the other side, if the Liturgy, etc., be not 'popery,' as they must not be, if 'the doctrine of the Church of England' be complete against it; they are not abjured! So, however it be, the Covenanter is free from breach and folly. . . We protest 'to maintain' every person, that maketh this 'Protestation,' in whatsoever he shall do in the *lawful* pursuance of it: if a man should, thence, infer that we must 'defend' him whatsoever he shall do in the pursuance of it; if he shall move sedition, or the like, were not this a violation of the sense of this Covenant? And is [it] not the same, when we stretch the opposing of 'popery' so far as it is opposite to 'the doctrine of the Church of England,' to be meant 'against all popery' whatsoever; though it be granted it be maintained in 'the Church of England?' His foundation then, is most rotten; and what firmness can be in the building?"

We have felt compelled to copy this complex engine with which Geree thought to sap Burton's "foundation;" and if any reader think that Geree has not thus far laboured for nought, when that reader "awaketh" from the enchantment, his delusion may possibly have vanished "as a dream."^a

The Presbyterian takes upon himself to say that Burton "*should* have framed the argument thus, Those things are established by the laws of England, where 'the doctrine of the Church of England' is established; and therefore, according to 'the doctrine of the Church of England,' these things cannot be interpreted to be 'popery;' and so not within the verge of that 'Protestation' which is against popery as it is opposite to 'the doctrine of the Church of England!' Which objection, if he ever answer *erit mihi magnus Apollo*." We hesitate to proceed with a logician so fond of framing positions that he may show his ability at confutation; and yet places himself in this position, "This Author," says he, "is very good at bold assertions, but all as bad in confirmations; for what a good Christian may do, in weakness, I will not determine; but no wise Christian, as far as I can conceive, can judge that whatever shall be found to be 'popery,' is included in this 'Protestation,' but whatever is found to be popery against 'the doctrine of the Church of England,' which is the term limiting 'popery' in the Protestation." Which is as much as to say, that so much "popery" as is not "against the doctrine, etc.," is not intended in the

^a Ps. *sup.* v. 20.

“Protestation!” Wherefore so much waste of words, when this testy Vindicator suffered this sentence to pass under his pen: “All the Reformation to be expected from this Parliament, is not expected by this ‘Protestation:’ this is one degree to reform whatever popery or innovation, is against law established; this done, the Parliament is proceeding further to perfect hoped-for Reformation, by removing corruptions established by law?” Burton could have required no more.

The admirers of this opponent of Burton have little truly to boast of after the following concessions: “Mistake not, I plead not for them [those plants which our ‘heavenly Father hath not planted’^a], but to clear the sense of the ‘Protestation,’ that it may not be wrested to include them, as it is by this Author: of which wresting I see and fear manifest inconveniences.” The reader little expects, it may be, what “inconveniences” they are that are so “manifest.” Attend then, “First; The Honourable Houses of Parliament are by it [the ‘wresting’] wronged; and are thereby like to grow more opposite to the removing of the things here pleaded against: and so, as it is usually, this making haste will hinder the work it aims to further, unless this conceit be seasonably corrected. Secondly: This misinterpretation will hinder many from entering this ‘Protestation;’ which *remora* of so good a work had need be removed, which this answer [Geree’s] may further. Thirdly: Many that have taken it, are partly troubled because such things are yet suffered that they think they have protested against; which they think they should not only omit to act, but, also, by all means oppose. Partly, I see men are taken off for [from] praying for the abolition of such things as they conceive are already cast off by Protestation; and are inclined, by carnal violence, under this pretence, to do that in the Church which, by a spiritual violence, they should endeavour to prevail for with God, that so they may be prevailers with men to have public corruptions purged by public authority; which is a safe, comfortable, and honourable way. Lastly: Some, that think some things in themselves lawful and tolerable, I find, by this ‘Protestation Protested,’ to conceive them unlawful, as against the ‘Protestation,’ though in themselves indifferent. As to instance: though they think, and justly, that the use of the Liturgy in the whole form of it, as a complete service of God, to be many ways vicious, yet they think the use of some of the forms there which are without exception and more suited to the people’s wants, to be in themselves lawful. Notwithstanding, though not for his arguments to prove them popish, yet for his exposition of the ‘Protestation’ they refuse them; and not only refuse them, but lay imputation on those that use them as breakers of their vow and Protestation. . . . If any dissent from us we shall be more ready to contend with God than them: with God, I say, That He would move the Parliament to remove this form so excepted against and corrupt in the general composure of it; and, whatever other they prescribe, not exactly to tie the well-gifted to it, but leave a liberty to vary as God shall enable them: as I have heard it hath been in our dear sister-church of Scotland. Or if they tie them to any form, that they will rather tie

^a Matt. xv. 13.

them to the matter than the words, to prevent the broaching of errors in prayers; which, some think, was the first occasion of set forms." . .

"Another evil of this [Burton's] treatise which needed cure, [is that] it hath bred in some and nourished in others an opinion that our churches are not churches, nor our ministers true ministers, nor our sacraments to be participated without sin; whereby some are drawn to, and others confirmed in, a neglect of the servants and service of God: which is no small evil, that deserveth cure. Give me leave, therefore, a little to examine his grounds." They who are desirous of seeing how this Vindicator eludes Burton's charges, are referred to the "Vindication" itself: for ourselves, we see nothing but the oft-repeated palliatives, that, of two or more indefensible means or instruments, one is not so bad as another,—that established Presbytery is not so bad as established Prelacy;—and hence pass on to where Geree remarks that Burton proceeds "to overthrow all subordination in the particular churches of a nation, not only to one another,—which was never dreamed of,—but to any general government by officers gathered out of all and so set over all; and so he lays a ground for Independent Separate Churches, which he desires may be 'erected' in this nation. But this task of his," Geree tells us, "is undertaken and performed with better order and strength, by another author in the 'Presbyterial Government Examined.' And yet,"—he adds, "that hath received a solid answer by the assertor of the 'Scotch Government;' . . and therefore thither I shall remit the reader." He admits that the subject presses home, upon himself, and continues to say, "Because I perceive many are much unsettled,—and that, even of those to whom I have some relation,—with the things that are scattered in this discourse [of Burton's,] I will endeavour briefly to run over the things here that are material; especially such as have not a full answer in the above-mentioned treatise." His first endeavour is to define "a National Church," which "word," he admits, "neither is a Scripture phrase; nor do any give us a certain exposition of it, if by it they understand a church that hath some common national worship by some common pastor at some common place, as all the Jews had the same high priest and temple, etc.; . . in this sense, Christians have no national churches." But taking the phrase as used ordinarily, he "would fain know the reason, Why it is necessary that the members in a particular church should be of better metal than the members of a national church?" He disserts on this, till he arrives where he comes to say, "I would know again, for what reason it should be more dishonourable to Christ to be the Head of a Congregation that are not all 'visible saints' further than by profession and outward conformity; than to be the Head of a Nation, where all are not visible saints; or, why Christians should be in more danger, for being one by profession in a Congregational body; than Christ and [the] Prophets, for being one with such as were not visible saints in a National body? These," says Geree, "I confess are riddles to me!" The riddle had been easily solved, had he but been disposed to consider the difference between a voluntary and a compulsory "profession!" Our Lord made a clear distinction, Matt. xv. 8, 9.

We have next the astounding doctrine attempted to be maintained, that Christ, in the parable of the tares and wheat, Matt. xiii. 24—30, 36—42, shows . . . “a general separation is not to be attempted till ‘the end of the world.’” Is it not strange indeed, that this writer should overlook his own current term of qualification, “general?” This one word meets the case so exactly that Geree might have spared his pains: “I have stuck the longer in this,” he writes, “because this is the *cardo controversiæ*, the hinge on which the rest is turned!”

We shall not condescend to test the logic of Geree’s subsequent paragraph, but are willing to listen to his information that “The Parliament are about a great and good work of removing erroneous and scandalous ministers, and setting up godly and learned lights every where; and withal, giving, or confirming rather, power to the godly pastors to keep off those that are unfit for the sacrament by gross ignorance or scandalous life: by which means parishes, that are already taught, may be quickly brought into better order; and those that are not, may by teaching be brought to some good measure of understanding and desire of the sacrament, and some—at least outward—Reformation, before they be required or admitted to communion in the sacrament.” Seeing he has drawn a picture which represents truly all that has ever been charged against parochial assemblies; we shall not attend upon him while he tries to fence with Burton respecting admitting ordinary profane persons to the sacrament, “pell-mell;” equivocating thus, “The place, Eph. v. 5—7, . . . ‘be not partakers with them,’ is clearly meant in regard of their sins, not the sacrament, as appears by the following verse [the 8th.]” O shame! Equivocating still, through his two following paragraphs he continues, “In his next answer, he [Burton] affirms that no communion can be had in our parish assemblies, possibly, without ‘setting up’ new churches. . . . Let there be shown any example or precept in the Scripture, that, in our case, new churches should be erected, and not the old repaired and brought back to the rule from which they have swerved, and we will yield the cause.” The phrase “in our case,” is emphatic here, and till both sides are agreed upon its meaning the challenge must remain suspended: “the cause” is the Lord’s, and His “Word” shall prosper in the thing whereto He hath sent it! ^a For Burton’s prayer for the Reforming Parliament, that they may be directed in doing all the good for it that a National Church admits of; Geree says, “I thank him for his affection; but yet if his doctrine of the Independency of churches be sound, this prayer cannot be of faith; for a man cannot pray in faith that men should meddle with that which is not within their sphere or calling: and sure, if Independency be a liberty of Christ, all the Parliament hath to do is to assert this liberty, and what is more is but usurpation.” In this way it sometimes happens that an opponent lets slip what is noble and just in sentiment; regardless of its being to his own injury, provided it cost his adversary somewhat also. It should seem, however, that where a tolerant spirit is manifested, it can meet with little or no sympathy in a Presbyterian: “He discovers, methinks,” so writes Geree, “too much uncharitableness and self-love, where he affirms, let them [parishes] have their

^a Isai lv. 11.

liberty ; and do for the rest, 'what' they 'will' ; 'it is indifferent' to them : a little more care of the souls of Christians," he adds, "might better suit with those that so far transcend others in outward Reformation !" Passing his next remarks as captious and futile, we are arrived at his prayer in closing, in which at least we are one with him.

"What remains, but that while we that mind the same things—Christ's honour, in the salvation of his people, and right performance of his ordinances, and differ only in the way,—labour to keep unity of heart till we have unity of judgment. And let our prayers be united at the Throne of Grace, though our persons be in different societies, That God may persuade the wanderers into the Tents of those to whom He hath vouchsafed the better light : that God may have the more honour, and we the more strength and comfort by our free and scruple-less consociation. Which mercy, the Lord vouchsafe for Jesus Christ's sake, by the help of the Spirit of Truth leading into all truth : to whom be glory for ever."

CHAP. XXXIX.

SURVEY OF BURTON'S PROTESTATION PROTESTED.—HIS SERMON ON LUKE IX. 23.

THE Presbyterian having entered upon the field of combat, and having made his exit with as much grace as he could ; Burton was assailed from the high tower of the Episcopalians, with a formidable Hall-like projectile, bearing the inscription of "A Survey of that Foolish, Seditious, Scandalous, Profane Libel, 'The Protestation Protested.' 1641." 4to. pp. 40. [48.]

But first, the "Reader" is told, of "This flash, the sudden thoughts of a day," to "take it as it is ; an autoschediastic ! The same affection to my Mother, the Church, screwed it from me, that loosed his tongue in defence of his father ; she may say to her more concerned sons, as Jacob to his, 'Why stand you gazing one upon another ?'^a A fatal lethargy hath so stiffened their imaginations, that nothing is heard from them but the damps and groans of a dying body ; whether sydere tacti, or fallen in a spiritual premunire, I know not. . . This comet points also at the State ; for the loose-reined popularity the Libeller aims at is no less dangerous to the liberty of the subject, than a too high-tuned prerogative. . . I do ingenuously protest I am no enemy to the agents or petitioners for a Reformation : the last times abound most in lees, and the evening horizon hath the thickest vapours ; but a medicine, not a destructive, must purge those ; a beam, not a thunderclap, dispel these. Only the sectaries who swell now beyond the reach of names and numbers, I have here glanced at. . . Let thy charity extend to the errors of the press." Charity had need also to be extended to the viciousness of

^a Gen. xlii. 1.

style ! But now for the noise and smoke of this “moderate”^a churchman’s^b culverin.

“Goodman Cobbler,—It is you that hath stitched together this tub-sermon ;—or whosoever else, of the most holy inspired fraternity ! I have taken you, Sir, for my task. And that because of my abilities, Nil sutor ultra crepidam, I dare venture no further than your old *shoes* : if I can find you there, and that your trade mistake not the reformation of *soles*, it is well ; but you are become a preacher at the *last*, and, by that old piece of yours—such stuff you meddle with—taken from Barrowe or Mar-prelate’s relics, hath made the scissure worse.”

We must really entreat for the reader’s “charity” while we proceed with this the most unpropitious of exordiums, promising him that if he can persevere with ourselves he will gather “interest” in his progress.

“Nor shall I trouble your conscience, to thrust order upon you, whose religion it is to condemn all order. I must follow you as you have followed your enthusiasms ; and that in the same manner, for as in preaching and prayer you are extemporary, so am I in answering. I am not two days your debtor, lest you, as your usurious brethren are wont, had expected interest ! It was too much cost to bestow paper though not pains upon you. When I traced every step of your lazy and superfluous discourse to have joined [combat] with my adversary, I found you as naked as an Adamite ;^c not one reason, the least piece of armour, with you. It had been a shame therefore, to have drawn upon you ; I have only used the whip, that may, perhaps, teach you sense.

“It is true, four times you cite antiquity, but in your own way ; that is, with greater respect to heathenism than Christianity if that proceed from a bishop ! for you marshal three ethnic emperors with one Eusebius. And why him, I pray you ? Doth not this derogate from your infallibility—if, in a single syllable, you be obliged to a Father ? What ! are not you and your Bible the only judge of controversies ? Can any one find out the true meaning of Scripture except yourself, who hath monopolized—with all piety and reverence be it spoken—the Spirit of Truth ? To say otherwise were to prefer Rome to Amsterdam ! But I do forgive you ; you have dealt very moderately in this point : one only you mention, and him in matter of fact. The rest of the book is your own invention, where you have as faithfully abstained from learning and antiquity as—and they are so to you—from heresy and superstition.

“If the reader complain of vinegar in the ink, let him remember that the bite of the viper,—and such they are that rend the bowels of their mother, the Church—is best helped by the antidote of vipers. A frenzy is hardly cured but by the lance, the scourge, the whipping post. Dark rooms indeed, and a large dose of hellebore, were the fittest attendants for such rovings. But give me leave to convey him home to his Bedlam ; there, in the paroxism of his madness, to have his family exercise ; and, by the way,—though I wander after him, that hath long since wandered from himself,—I hope in charity so [to] belabour the man that he may, henceforth, know that part of Scripture practically,—if it be not against his justification to know any [thing] so,—‘a rod is for the back of the fool.’^d Nor wish I worse success to all his braying associates ; though their *lugs* be without the Bishops’ visitation,

^a See back, vol. i. p. 185, note b.

^b “Did he [Hall] never see a pamphlet intituled after his own fashion, ‘A Survey of that Foolish, Seditious, etc. Libel ?’ The child doth not more expressly refigure the visage of his father, than that book resembles the style of the Remonstrant in those idioms of speech wherein he seems most to delight : and in the seventeenth page, three lines together are taken out of the [‘Humble’] Remonstrance’ [1640.] word for word, not as a citation, but as an author borrows from himself. Whoever it be, he may as justly be said to have libelled, as he against whom he writes.” Milton’s “Apology for Smectymnuus, 1642,” Edit. 1833, imp. 8vo. sec. ii. p. 85.

^c “A kind of Anabaptists, who think clothes to be cursed, and given to man for a punishment of sin, whereas they think themselves innocent and without sin.” E. Pagit’s Heresiography, Ed. 1662. 12mo. p. 37, 117.

^d Prov. xxvi. 3.

yet I hope their necks are within that of the Parliament! That Honourable and Judicious Assembly will, in due time, provide against these monstrously absurd libels; that heap of nonsense, from the which such a vapour of stupidity and ignorance is exhaled, that who are strangers to our better times, if they behold this island through the same, shall verily think it under a universal lunacy. But I have staid you too long before the door.

"You usher in that discourse of yours by a preface used, belike, many times before your Dresser-lectures, and tell us something of 'conscience' and its 'scale,' not unlike the lap-wing, keeping the greatest stir when you are furthest from your nest. 'Conscience' in the contemplation, in the pretence, is yours, but what have you to do with it in the reality?—so here, you press it in the practice! Beware this care of yours *in agendis* make you not suspect of merit, if not of supererogation! The piece of Scripture you make bold with, in my poor judgment comes not home to the point; the words do rather concern a voluntary than imposed vow, if any be such; and therefore, had been more congruous,—if, as you do by your infallibility, you had justified the matter,—to the holy 'Protestation' is [as] made in your Par-
lour-meetings, for tearing a liturgy, rending a surplice, burning the rails, and pluming a bishop! But you cheat the world with a froth of words, and amuse the well-meaning, but the ignorant, multitude with an empty noise of 'conscience,' purity, and reformation. They say it is an evil sign, to stumble at the threshold;—and if God take 'no pleasure in fools,' you have prefixed a very slender approbation to your book!

"Your next is, you 'tremble' to see what small account most men do make of so solemn a vow!^a How do you,—which is yours, *quarto modo*,—prêach and practise contradictions? Were ever the most superlative votaries of the Church of Rome, Jesuits, and Seminary priests, more obstinately mis-zealous in refusing oaths as civil and ecclesiastical tyranny and antichristianism, than you, when they suit not with your passions and interests? Witness, these of Supremacy and Canonical-Obedience; the Gate-house can tell us how much less you have esteemed your bodily than your Christian liberty in such cases. And if the fear to be plundered

^a "There is no oath, scarcely, but we swear to things we are ignorant of: for example, the oath of Supremacy; how many know how the King is King? what are his right and prerogative? So, how many know what are the 'privileges' of the Parliament, and the 'liberty' of the subject, when they take the 'Protestation'? But the meaning is, they will defend them when they know them. . . I cannot conceive how an oath is imposed where there is a party [parity]; namely, in the House of Commons they are all *pares inter se*; only one brings paper and shows it to the rest, they look upon it, and, in their own sense, take it. Now, they are not *pares* to me who am none of the House, for I do not acknowledge myself their subject; if I did, then no question I was bound by an oath of their imposing. It is to me, but reading a paper in their own sense. There is a great difference between an assertory oath and a promissory oath. An assertory oath is made to a man before God, and I must swear so as man may know what I mean; but a promissory oath is made to God only, and I am sure he knows my meaning. So in the new oath, it runs, 'Whereas I believe in my conscience, &c. I will assist thus and thus;' that 'Whereas' gives me an outloose, for if I do not believe so, for aught I know I swear not at all. In a promissory oath, the mind I am in is good interpretation; for if there be enough happened to change my mind I do not know why I should not. If I promise to go to Oxford to-morrow, and meant it when I said it, and afterwards it appears to me that it will be my undoing; will you say I have broke my promise, if I stay at home? Certainly I must not go. The Jews had this way with them concerning a promissory oath or vow: If one of them had vowed a vow which afterwards appeared to him to be very prejudicial, by reason of some thing he either did not foresee or did not think of when he made his vow; if he made it known to three of his countrymen they had power to absolve him, though he could not absolve himself; and that they picked out of some words in the text. Perjury hath only to do with an assertory oath; and no man was punished for perjury by man's law till queen Elizabeth's time. It was left to God as a sin against him. The reason was, because it was so hard a thing to prove a man perjured. I might misunderstand him, and he swears as he thought." The Table-Talk of John Selden, Esq. [Obiit 1654.] Ed. 1789. 12mo. Art., "Oaths," ii—vi.

of a fair estate, or the love to a fatter benefice, can buy in this niceness of yours, and persuade you to lose a button [*sic*,] you have no more 'conscience' in observing than you had obedience in taking the oath: for if Authority be in the waning, and some popular Stars promise you 'liberty,' how soon do you break these cords asunder, and with a *Jus jurandum illicitum solummodo stringit ad pœnitentium*, start you aside like a deceitful bow? yea, think yourself obliged to redeem your slackened vigour by an after increase of heat and violence? Yet are you still the same man; love of gain prescribed your oath, and the same absolves you from it; which, doubtless, your honesty, by a mental reservation, did ever lay as a ground. Happy you! whose 'conscience' can mould and fashion itself to the impress of the times, and ebb and flow with the aspect of different occasions! Be ashamed, therefore,—'tremble' you cannot,—when you 'see what small account' most of you make of your solemn vows. God is not mocked; nor shall your brags of casting out devils of idolatry and superstition in his Name, save you in that day.

"Having thus skirmished, you advance with the main battle; subjoining that the 'ministers and people have taken the Protestation, and have solemnly vowed to maintain the doctrine of the Church, so far as it is opposite to Popery!' They have so, and so might they ever perform; but cannot one devil be cast out unless seven enter? Have they therefore vowed to erect Anabaptism? Is there no mid betwixt the extremes? no salvation! but either in the communion of the one, or conventicle of the other? Must either a shaveling or a scavenger, be the 'star' to point us out the way to Christ? Lend us some of your light, your tallow, to find out a consequence here, I pray. I must tell you, and,—*ni frons periit*,—you may blush at it! you have defiled your father's house [*sic*,] and laid us open to the opprobrious insolence of the common enemy who, eying us in—you—our dross, wantonly upbraid us to have rejected, under the name of superstition, all visibility of a church, and by the title of Purity to have brought in nothing else but profaneness and atheism.^a

"Your objections—though like Ixion's cloud, airy; and by your own fancy and supposition,—I pass them by as the only orthodox part in you; and shall strictly tie myself to your Answers, lest I seem rather to have sought a cause than found a party. In your first and second, you make your posture and take your aim; in the third, you let in the thrust against the Church of England, but with no less mistake nor better success than when Don Quixote—one who, for a head-piece, might have been Moderator to your Diet—*justed* against the windmill instead of the enchanted castle. At the first view, by the multiplying glass of your Purity, you can descry four of the Beast's heads, and inform us that the 'Liturgy, etc.' are Popish. Suppose now, it were so; is not your curse who discovereth your Mother's 'nakedness' double to his who did not cover his father's? ^b But I have mistaken you; your *anabaptization* doth privilege you to be none of her sons... How shall they [the Romanists] triumph over us and our unnecessary debates,—they fight closely within doors, when we bawl in the streets,—telling us we cannot agree amongst ourselves until we return *ad Petram unde excisi sumus*! What you say in defence of this your general position, we shall see on each particular; only I cannot pass your 'imposition' of the Liturgy: *hinc illæ lachrymæ*. Anything that is by Order and Authority is burdensome! You idolize only the calves of your own making; that is, of your crazed imagination. But how shall this humour of yours suit with the unity of a church? Can many shreds of cloth make a garment; and do not you remember that Christ's coat was without a seam? ^c Your third ground is of the same bullion, and carrieth your image, that is, of Schism and Democracy: you have vowed 'against all Popery,' and 'finding the particulars' mentioned to be so, you will 'have no more communion with them.' What if you should find the Decalogue and the Lord's Prayer,—as you have already, the Creed,—to be Popish, must not all the principles of our religion, for your pleasure, be drawn within the verge of a thundering abjuration? Nor is this fear in vain: your precisest Gospellers already deny the law, as only suitable to the climate of

^a P. 2—5.

^b Gen. ix. 25.

^c "As it is noted by one of the Fathers, Christ's coat indeed had no seam, but the church's vesture was of divers colours; whereupon he saith, *In veste varietas sit, scissura not sit*: they be two things, Unity, and Uniformity." Essays, by Lord Bacon. "Of Unity of Relig."

the Jews; and some of your best Rabbies make it a case of 'conscience' not to say the Lord's Prayer, that *magicum canticum*, as they term it, *Pontificorum!*"^a

"It is your next care to draw the Parliament to your party; but there is no communication betwixt light and darkness. Nature hath taught all Entities to intend their own preservation; nor can that Honourable Court forget its being, and join with you. . . You take the supremacy upon you, and, with intolerable pride and foolishness, presume to give us the infallible sense and meaning of the Parliament. . . But let us examine your reasons. First; 'They intended' the Protestation 'against all Popery,' it is granted. . . But who gave you authority to cleanse the Temple, unless you maintain that all power is from the People; your hands: and, that you may stop the well-spring, the fountain, when the fit takes you. Secondly; You remember us, that the Honourable House of Commons will not have the Protestation 'extended to the maintenance of any Form of worship, etc.:' and therefore, they condemn them as Popish! What a wild consequence is this? . . That they did not, is clear. . . first, from the main distance they put betwixt 'Popery and popish Innovations,' and the 'Form of worship, discipline, etc., of the Church of England,' intersected by such a period as your ends shall never be able to draw together: secondly, from their laudable and religious practice in being at all occasions present at the Service of the Church, wherein none but 'Familists,'—who do conform themselves to any public worship,—can imagine their integrity and nobleness; for all the world would prevaricate if they had but thought—much less declared—the Liturgy, as you would have it, to be 'the Mass-book.' And for 'the government of the Church by archbishops and bishops,' this is the heel you would most willingly bruise, because it bruises your head! it is no less evident that the Protestation doth not condemn that: first, from their actual sitting in the House. Should these members integrate that body, if they were already adjudged as limbs of the Antichrist? This were a too heterogeneous fancy. Secondly, What needed the late dispute concerning the present Discipline, if the sentence had been already passed? Thirdly, Would so considerable men for honesty, wisdom, and power, of that number whose reasons militate for episcopacy, have stood up in defence of a main branch of popery, and not have been ashamed—if not punished—for publicly maintaining the Antichrist and contradicting their late vow and order? These reasons,—nill you, will you,—do convince you that it was 'not' the intention of the Parliament,—as you, to arm them against ecclesiastical persons and orders in every corner of the kingdom, would bear the people in hand,—to protest against,—though it seemed not fitting to protest for—the present discipline, government, and ceremonies of the Church. If you had a forehead you would be ashamed of this boldness, but your obduration hath no more sense

"Quam si dura silex, aut stet Marpesia cautes.

"These great patrons of Church and State shall, no doubt, punish this malapert sauciness of yours; for their love to peace and truth cannot permit such a firebrand to belie their intention, and abuse the credulous simplicity of the multitude. I am confident this reply of mine shall first visit you in the Gate-house. Did you, I beseech you, ever think it possible that the roarings and outcries of such braying schismatics as yourself could have induced the Honourable Court of Parliament to change upon a sudden, the whole face of the Church as that of a scene, upon the daring and mis-grounded information of your ignorant and malicious libels. The dross, the off-scourings of the multitude are yours; these, and these only, you are able to induce by promises, or deceive by pretences. Tell them as you do, that they are 'the people of God,' set apart for the great work! and shall not this ambition blow up the unconstant vulgar? Show them they may change their fortunes, and [at] last share in the public government, you may draw them along with you to the slaughter, though there you leave them with your grandfather Muncer's^b benediction, *Si quidem populus vult decipi, decipiatur.* . . Your parity brings along with it an anarchy; and that, all imaginable ruin and confusion. I'll tell you in your ear, you had better

^a P. 7—10.

^b "Who, raising a sedition of boors in Germany was defeated, taken and beheaded, about the year of our Lord God, 1525. He preached that all goods must be common, and all men free, and of equal dignity: that God had commanded him to destroy all the ungodly, and to repurge the church." Pagit, Heres, p. 35: Quoting Sleidan's Commentaries, lib. v.

keep your pamphlets at home; and have restrained the late jealous stirs at Southwark, and St. Margaret's,^a if you would not have had your passions detected. These staring looks of yours so soon after the change, do foretell what madness you may come to at the height of the moon; and will, no doubt, persuade that supreme judicatory either to draw blood of you in time, or to provide manacles for binding up your furious attempts, lest you tear out your own bowels. Your third reason, leans to a thought—a supposition,—and is a strain of your old lunacy, That the Honourable House of Commons 'did' intend to exclude whatsoever should be found to be a branch of Popery: but who should find it so, themselves, or you? . . . Rather think that the Protestation hath an edge to cut out your tongue, than to cut off what your unsettled imagination, after a Friday's supper from the back of an oyster-board, shall, Dictator-like, happen to belch up. You tell us, in the fourth place, that you 'are all in an erected hope of a Reformation' from 'this most noble Parliament;' and so are we too: yea, no less confident than yourselves that all Popish trash shall 'be made packing;' but may it please you to go along with that baggage, and attend the safe transportation of these fopperies, we shall be rid of two great evils! At your return from Rome, you may take your rest by the way with your brethren at Amsterdam. No peace for Israel how long the Jebusites are thorns in our sides: and if the Papists and you—I cannot tell how to name you, unless it be Legions, you are so many—the foxes, the boutefeux, joined by the tails, were once removed, we should have good hopes no more to see our cornfields on fire. The Reformation you expect, is a deformation; your active zeal extends to the purifying of churches, yea of churchyards, as lately one of your society was buried in the fields, lest his sanctified body might be polluted by consecrated, that is superstitious, ground. A strange 'separation' that holds even amongst the dead! But when you have banished from us all that can speak us Christians what shall be the event? The sad ruins of a torn Church and State, yea of religion itself, is at the stake; for the more weak and conscientious people, who expect salvation in some church, will rather join with Rome than have no church at all; like the fish, changing the hot water for the hotter fire: others, who have made religion their handmaid, shall be bold to laugh at piety, and think it nothing but an invention of policy to bridle the humours of the less daring, and to encompass the designs of the more active wits: so the fruits of your Reformation shall be like those of Gomorrah, pleasing to the sight, but, in effect, either apostacy or atheism. In your fifth ground, I acknowledge your perfect idiom, the complete language of Amsterdam. There you tell me that 'suppose the House of Commons' had not intended the removal of these things but the protection, rather, of the same; yet 'private Christians' must put to their hands and 'reform themselves,' and live no longer 'school-boys and punies under the ferula of that Discipline.' Now you speak to the point, and have but dallied hitherto. Bishops, I see, and Parliaments, are in the same respect to you if once they cross your humour: if this be not a trumpet of sedition, there is nothing so. Go on, and give not over till the Commonwealth be fitted to your Church,—as one of yours said, 'the hangings to the room;'—let us have that prodigious monster your Parity, in both, without so much as distinction of head and feet, and then you may reform when and what, and how you please! Can there be the least thought of loyalty and subjection beneath this, when such an 'O Yes,' is made for every man to take up arms and to reform what comes first unto his hand? Nor is it a wonder to hear this from you: ere all be done you will speak with a higher tone, even, That the property of all goods is your own: for it is your doctrine, That we have fallen from all dominion and right to the creature, by the mortal sin of Adam. This, say you, was restored by Christ, who reserved the dominion to Himself—there, your love to magistracy!—but gave the right to his children, the sons of the church; these, whom the Conventicle hath assured that they are marked with the 'white stone.'^b You may therefore, possidere terram; and who, besides you, do so, are but usurpers! Yet give me leave to wonder if, in a settled Church and State, some care be not taken to suppress this madness whereby every man is invited to a freedom and liberty of doing what his humour suggesteth; as if this 'Diana' of yours inspired nothing else but frenzy and rebellion. You will, by this your exorbitancy, make the Bishops' enemies long after them, and, while they are going out at doors, pull them back by the gowns. In the time of

^a Qy. ? Westminster; not that "stir" formerly in Southwark. ^b Rev. ii. 17

their power which of you durst vent such dangerous whimsies? Now you teach us that, by one blow, we cannot lop off the inconveniency of Bishops and the inconveniency of no Bishops; and that the greatest danger in a mutation is that all dangers cannot be foreseen... The Honourable House of Commons... will provide for that fire, that gangrene, of yours, which hath already inflamed the bed-straw, and seized almost upon the very heart of the kingdom.^a

"In your sixth answer, you dealt your strokes about you. Your first blow is at the Liturgy. This you observe to be popish in two respects: First, 'in regard of the whole frame and matter of it, as being translated out of the Romish Latin Liturgy.' But is it not 'the Romish Liturgy' translated? that is, is there anything in the Mass-book which is not in the Book of Service? If your answer be negative, I leave you to be hissed at: but if affirmative, what advantage have you gotten by this envious calumny? Do you think we may not use what is in the Mass-book consonant to Scripture and purest antiquity? To say otherwise, were to deny the Lord's Prayer and the Decalogue^b because they are there... And why may there not be some few pearls in that dunghill, the Mass-book? If these be culled out, and according to Scripture and the best pattern of ancient Liturgies, ... what can malice or ignorance say against it? ... All must be admitted from them, errors with truths; all rejected by you, truths with errors: they destroy the perfection of the Scripture, you the being of the Church: you no less enemies to the authority of this, than they to the belief of that. But let both of you roar like the lioness bereaved of her whelps, and mix heaven and earth together by your lowings, Naaman shall be the same man, to us, before and after his washing.^c We will, in despite of Papists, cleanse the leprosy; in spite of you, retain the substance. You mention the late 'Parallel'... He is an ungracious son of the Church who hath falsely invented these whoredoms; and they the unworthy offspring of such a mother, if they rest unrevenge! Meantime, what a death it is to think of the sport and advantage our watchful enemies will be sure to make of our self-confession, That we have the same public worship which, in them, we do condemn as heresy, as idolatry! What exprobrations, what triumph of theirs will hence ensue. How shall we argue against them, without bespattering our own faces, in time to come? All our help is that the treatise itself—the 'Parallel'—is so ridiculous a piece that it will be thought the dreams of a sleeping person. ... You tell us you 'omit to say,' what you cannot, you dare not say; all your frivolous exceptions are so fully answered by the learned Mason, judicious [R.] Hooker, and others, that it will be three ages yet ere you attain to so much judgment as to understand their discourses! ... If we [you] dare call the settled laws of Church and State in question, we shall, by the meanest of five thousand in England, stop your black and ignorant mouths... And you, Sir, who hath made all this din, how shall a man find you out, either to convert you or to be converted by you? Your name, it seems, was affrighted of the title-page; but it may be you had none, and that this libel hath been penned by you in the interim betwixt your renunciation of that name you had from the Church of England and your *anabaptization*. You add, there are 'vitious' things—*animus meminisse horret*—that 'run through all the veins' of the Service-book. All the letters of the alphabet cannot furnish censures for this blasphemous Rabshakeh. God rebuke thee, Satan! 'Sufficiently discovered;' by whom? in whose age? Did your Separatists ever produce any thing upon this subject, but lazy, indigested fables, as far from learning as their authors from sense? ... Your second general respect is, 'The imposition' of the Liturgy 'upon all men's consciences.' Let the matter be never so laudable, yet the manner—'the imposition,'—is a wile of the Antichrist. Here I entreat Geneva to answer you, whose Church hath an imposed, a set-form of Liturgy; and whose worthiest men, Calvin and Beza, do stoutly maintain the Church's power in prescribing ceremonies and orders for unity and peace' sake. ...^d

^a P. 10—15.

^b Say you so?

^c 2 Kings v. 14.

^d Calvin's comes under the distinction of "a species" of Liturgy, and is so called by the late Rev. John Scott, M.A. Vicar of North Ferriby, &c., in his *Continuation of the Milners' Hist. of the Church of Christ*, 1831, 8vo. vol. iii. an. 1542, p. 372. It accords to the Presbyterian "Directory" of 1644, but not at all to the English "Common Prayer." It is headed in Latin, "*Precum Ecclesiasticarum Formula*;" and it has no responses to be made audibly. But the last paragraph in our account of Apollonius, Chap. LVI., will show the judgment of foreigners upon the Anglican "Forms prescribed."

I am confident the Church and State of England are not so weary of themselves as to become slaves to your fancy; this, perhaps, may fit America, where there is no government at all, but how it may subsist with the being of a kingdom here, I understand it not. . . . Speak out, dare you say it in open terms, though indeed you say as much, That the king and parliament, because of the Liturgy imposed, have denied Jesus to be Christ: Tyburn for you, if you do! You, indeed, seem rather stained with this blasphemy, who hath boldly and profanely averred, that bowing at that sacred Name is idolatry, and—as you jeer with the bad thief on the cross—‘Jesu-Worship!’^a But let me, from your own principles, use one argument against you: Whosoever prescribeth to their people a set form of prayer, do lord it over the conscience and are the very Antichrist; but your extemporary prayers in public, are, to your people, a set form of prayer; you, therefore, are the Antichrist! The major is your own, the subsumption is proved by this inevitable dilemma, When you pray before your hearers, either it is as their mouth to God, or for yourselves only: if you say, the last; you contradict the action itself, your expressions, and the cause of your meeting; and, if the first, must not the people join with you in word, or at least in thought? And is not this, to be stinted and tied to ‘a form’ of prayer, how raw and senseless soever? By your ‘sole Lawgiver,’ you express your thoughts of Authority: you can hear of no general commission, for ordering the House of God as place and time shall require; but pardon me to believe ‘the Apostle’ better than you, who hath not in vain appointed this qualification, ‘Omnia fiant decenter et ordine.’^b ‘And for this cause the Pope,’ say you, ‘is proved to be the Antichrist,’ in that he ‘sitteth in and [or, *sic* Burton] over the Temple of God;’ that is, as you please to paraphrase it, ‘the consciences of men:’ it had been well you had spoken with application. You are the only man I know who must have all men’s consciences squared by the supposition of your own. The ‘will-worship’ you name is, truly, that you practise; that is, an affected contradictious way, in the service of God, to Scripture, to antiquity, to the Church you live *in*, to discretion, yea to Christianity itself. . . .^c

“Having choked, as you think, the Liturgy, with this ill-peec’t [ill-piqued] discourse of yours concerning the ‘Antichrist,’ your second onset is upon the ‘Ceremonies’ of the Church. . . . There is no greater error committed by you sectaries than that because the Church of Rome hath thrust upon us some unnecessary, many superstitious, ceremonies, you would have the Reformation to have none at all: not considering that ceremonies, as the hedge, do fence the substance of religion from the indignities that profaneness and irreligion sometimes put upon it. . . . For you, you are so spiritual,—though some think you no less carnal than your neighbours,—I am afraid your religion may evaporate in words, turn in the smoke of a thin airy profession, and as no substance of good works, so leave no visibility of worship behind it. Though now, while the heat of a party keeps in the fire, you seem to have some zeal in your breasts, if you were settled on your dregs, and, after this great motion, returned to your cold blood, it is very possible you shall have no religion at all! . . . The matter imposed is left, in its own nature, indifferent still, though not so in the practice; and this very same restraint enlargeth their Christian liberty: for otherwise, they would be in conscience obliged to abstain from everything that the nice and peevish humorist should conceive to be offensive; now, being tied by a law, they may use their freedom; yea, must prefer a necessary duty to an imaginary scandal. But . . . you love that order, and not any besides it, that may be raked out of the ashes of monarchy; but your late injuries meeting with its discretion, will teach a necessity of foresight not to adventure huge bodies as you are, quia suo feruntur pondere, down steep hills, that is, to your own swinge.^d

“Your third endeavour is against the ‘Discipline’ of the Church in exercising the power of ‘excommunication!’ this you prove to be ‘another’ branch of ‘Popery,’ because it is from the Church of Rome. . . . You do well to deny all ‘censures’ . . . lest you might happen to be punished for this contumacy. . . .^e

“The fourth plea is against the root of all bitterness; the very heart and lungs of the ‘Antichrist:’ the government of ‘Bishops!’ Each casual mishap in them must

^a Burton had just published, 1641, “Jesu-worship Confuted: Or, Certain Arguments against Bowing at the Name ‘Jesus.’ With Objections to the Contrary fully Answered.” 4to. pp. 6. “It is but pious idolatry, or idolatrous piety.”—p. 5.

^b 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

^c P. 15—19.

^d P. 20—22.

^e P. 22.

be an error; so will your Rabbies have to be: who, deeming themselves less in employment than in merit, do heartily rail against that which they heartily desire, the Rochet! This, you say, is not of 'Divine,' therefore it must be of diabolical 'institution:' can you give a reason of this consequence? . . . You are so naked in your outward worship—as the wrestlers of old—it is impossible to lay hold upon you. . . . I must therefore go about to prove the government of Bishops to be of 'Divine institution' or nothing. And here I will take the surest way, that is, to show the Divine institution of Episcopacy from Christ himself; not from the precept and practices of the Apostles, else you would slip out of my fingers, and tell me, 'That, if not by the blessed Apostles themselves,' as one of yours said, 'yet in their time, this mystery of iniquity of antichristianism did begin to work.' My assertion is, therefore, . . . that the apostolical office itself, in its proper and reciprocal acts, was nothing else but the Episcopal,—I see you startle, and change your complexion,—as it is now-a-days exercised in the Church of England! Whether the ordination of that function was John xxi. 15, or xx. 22; or as others, more probable, by these words, 'As my Father sent me, so send I you;' in the same place, and at the same time, were 'Bishops' ordained: these are the Apostles' successors *in asse et ex solido*, in all things that ever was assentative to their office. . . . Nothing [is] essential to that office *in constituendo*, but the acts of ordination and jurisdiction; these, the apostles, as apostles, once had; and these, by the same right of institution transmitted, by the succession of many ages, to the present Bishops! I see you angry at this: *stant lumina flamma*. . . . You see now I have not troubled your conscience with Timothy and Titus,—and these shall be still bishops to me, while you prove the circular and monthly changes,—I have derived the original of Episcopacy from the apostles' office, not their authority. . . . Thus have I flourished with you: it were a shame to bestow a blow in earnest upon such a poor smatterer as yourself. I have ever thought it the best refutation of you and of your cause, to lay your foolish impertinences open to the eye of the world; then I am assured only those who love to have their brains suspected would give you the least approbation. You find in the administration of the Episcopal office 'the perfect image of the Papal Beast, from horn to hoof!' but stay and take it home to yourselves, who are the only beasts I know amongst men. . . . You are pleased to call the ministers 'a dumb' priesthood, 'a mockery:' what disgrace is this to the Church, to these that have baptism from her, or do expect salvation in her? You have, indeed, named them Bald-pates,^a with those ungracious children; but take your seat for it, in the first psalm, and there stay for your punishment. . . . I think it strange that you, who deny all outward calling, except that from the People, should think 'the Curates' none of 'the ministers of Christ,' in that they 'derive their ministry from the Antichristian Hierarchy:' if no Orders be necessary, sure a mistake of Orders cannot be much prejudicial! Hence, let the world judge, how both these malicious factions spend their fury upon the Church of England. The Papists object, that she hath forfeited her ordination; you, that she hath none. But the Papists, they tell us, we are no church because we want a priesthood; you, because we have one. They will hear of none but a monarchical subjection; you do establish a democracy in the church, or an anarchy rather. They complain of perjury, because we refuse to maintain their Orders,—as if who, amongst them, had sworn canonical obedience to a heretical bishop, were obliged to be a heretic:—you, of the want of purity, because we do not renounce all continuation and Orders of the Church. In spite of you both, she shall still maintain a visible succession in the ministry, from the very apostles' times. May not the Church of Rome, though in her old age more faulty, give baptism; and may not this warrant the derivation of our Orders from her first and better times? But I crave you mercy, Sir; this argument doth not concern you, who, not after the Church of Rome only, but also in the Church of England, do re-baptize. . . . To maintain that every bishop is *de jure divino* . . . is not only to deny all dependence from Rome, but to give her her death's wound, by lopping off the prerogative whereby she subsists; for by virtue of this, appellations come to her, dispensations from her, exemptions of universities and religious houses—the main pillars—which, if the Bishops of Europe, by maintaining their office to be *de jure divino*, would challenge, as a usurpation, her borrowed feathers might, perhaps, return home to the first owners. . . . You mention Dr. Hall and his learned pieces:

^a "Saving that they are not shaven:" so, Burton.

out upon thee for a fool and a babbler! The works of that reverend, painful, and judicious Bishop, shall be entertained by posterity, with approbation and thankfulness, when the better times shall hiss thee and thy associates out of the Church. The quintessence of you all, do come short to the meanest crotchet of his learning, judgment, integrity, and eloquence; nor shall these your calumnies be aught else to him but 'stigmata Laudis!' cicatrices, to testify his conscience and resolution who had the courage to set his face against you, the Amalekites, when others turned the back. ^a For Pocklington, his very citation refutes you: you say he fails in that he cannot prove 'Rome's succession from Peter;' and yet you have said his assertion is, that he proved 'St. Gregory's succession from Peter.' But I forgive you; you knew not before, now you read it, that Gregory was Bishop of Rome!...^b You are assured that the [Hierarchical] Government is 'protested against:' if such a worm as myself might presume to speak of that Honourable Judicatory and the 'Protestation' made by it, I might, upon better grounds, argue that you and your sectaries are within the reach of the same. My instance shall be in one point—when I might, in a hundred,—that of Magistracy: your doctrine concerning it, is point-blank against the doctrine of the Church of England!...^c

"Hitherto I might have taken you up, by some pains; but now, you pass all understanding. Fall you once upon the business of Reformation, you rave perfectly; like these lunatics who will, perhaps, speak sense, [but] do they encounter with the purpose that first chafed them out of their wits, then straight they run out. Sir, by laughing at you, you have spared me the cost of physic for expelling melancholy. Your first assertion is that it will be 'impossible to constitute' a National Church 'agreeable, in all points,' to the 'visible Congregation of Christ!' Here you no less cross the Consistories than the Bishops, and therefore it shall be convenient to leave you to their refutation. ^d

"It is your brag,^e that there are 'many thousand saints, whose hearts are perfect before God.' That is pleasing to you. And shall these 'empty pitchers;' ^f these factious lights; these trumpets of discontent, multiplied to make a noise, affright the kingdom? I dare say, that if from your party you deduct madmen and fools—and none of these, are men envied—with such as love, for their own ends, to fish in your muddy waters, scarce a number, yea, scarce a unity, shall remain. Though you cry 'The sword of the Lord, and of Gideon,' ^g as a friend of yours did, in another kingdom, the Church and State of England will ever have prudence to detect your stratagems, and courage to ward your blows. . . Now you speak plain language in persuading a separation: . . it is a strange speech, 'be ye separate!' You therefore will begin *ab ovo*, and call together the 'holy' ones: . . but, how shall these be discerned? only by the infallibility, and presumed omniscience, of your spirit, that of 'error,' not that of 'truth!' ^h You only know these 'few names;' and here, you tell us that 'scarce' a number shall be found to make up these 'holy' [parish] meetings. . . Pray you, spare us the pains of separation; separate yourselves for some new colony in Virginia, and trouble not your pates about impossibilities. Would to God, you would leave us or your madness you, and then both of us should be at rest!" Now, let the whole world judge, if you be a fit man to usher in a Reformation; and thus boldly to thrust your impious sense upon the 'Protestation'—made by the Most Honourable Parliament,—whose head is fraught with such whimsies, and who can hear of nothing but the gathering of a new Church in this kingdom! And if we all had made a total 'apostacy' from the Faith, we should descry you blasphemously, 'as the apostles did when they came to plant churches in a country where the Gospel had not been formerly preached:' not your ears, but your neck is in danger for this! ⁱ

"But what answer you to the question, If they have not 'received baptism?' or, 'Are they not Christians?' Here something sticks in your throat. You answer negatively, by an equipollent metaphor, that 'the lame and blind are not to be offered up in a sacrifice to the Lord.' Do you thus tempt the patience of the

^a Thus might a son write in conjunction with his father: see Milton's Works.

^b Still Burton's position is not shaken; since neither Gregory nor any subsequent Bishop of Rome can be proved truly to have succeeded "Peter."

^c P. 24—31.

^d P. 32.

^e "There are a few, yea, I trust many, &c."

^f Jud. vii. 16.

^g Ver. 18.

^h 1 John iv. 6.

ⁱ P. 33, 34.

Prince and people? Is it nothing for you to object Paganism to them at every word? to call them profane, ignorant, unbaptized, unchristian persons? This were intolerable to any free soul; and must induce all those who have the smallest affection to generosity and religion, to provide a way how such monsters as yourself may be suppressed. You go on, and tell us the 'godly may not communicate with the profane.' *Quo Donate ruis?* are not all 'profane' to you, that are good churchmen and obedient subjects? .. I see there is a necessity laid upon us, to search the hearts of men; to have their breasts made of crystal; to find out their very thoughts; else no fellowship, no communion! But if every known sin be every man's, where is Christ's burden? What difference put you betwixt the Head and the branch? Others' uncleanness can no more defile you than your holiness excuse them: if you be for this 'separation' you must either fly out of the world, or your flight is in vain. The best metal here hath its dross; the best grain its offal; there is need indeed of a fan, and a furnace, but not that of yours—destructive; not purging. Nor stay you here: all are 'dogs' and 'swine' to you, that will not be of your kennel nor wallow in your puddle...^a

"The Reformation you aim at is straiter laced than either Consistories or Parishes: there is a 'necessity' of 'setting up' other 'Congregations,' besides these! Here your intent is to have all reduced to families. Old Nab must be your doctor and pastor: his wife, Tib, your deaconess; his son, Dick, your ruling-elder; and the serving-man, Will, your deacon: a pretty church indeed! and 'where none are to be admitted, but such as are approved by the whole assembly.' He and his household; the supreme and only Congregation upon earth: not any beyond it in purity, above it in jurisdiction. No more contests now, for Consistories, or Parochial Churches! you, for 'the avoiding of profaneness,' have assigned us a lesser circle; *ipse ratem conto subigit*; all will be well, and you be at the stern! Is this your model, your pattern of Reformation? It is so ridiculous, children will point at you and it, in the streets. If not for Christianity, yet for shame' sake abstain from such motions, for the which the enemies dreaming you and the Church of England to be concentric, name us no more 'heretics,' but madmen. Nor are you less dangerous than they. The innocent sheep are no less terrified by the barking of the dogs within, than by the howling of the wolves without. My very soul bleedeth, to think what discouragements you give us at home; what ignominy, and scandal, and disgrace, you are to us abroad. But you proceed, and tell us, 'If there must be 'a National Church, let not this exclude and bar out the free use of Congregations.' Here you play the Libertine: give you freedom, and you care not what religion is at the next doors... This is indeed the confusion your parity aims at, that every man may do what seemeth him good in his own eyes... You are willing to be daily spectators of the Antichristianism, and their patron—such is all to you, besides your sanctified Conventicle—of a National Church. 'Order; as they call it!' and how do you? you have no use, no name for 'order' at all: all besides your humour, though 'prescribed' by the State, must be 'order, as they call it!' this is your respect to Parliaments! You are the only mouths, I know, of all power and jurisdiction...^b

"You will have us to believe that though you are in, yet you are not of the world. You, good man! are 'separated from the world in the corruptions thereof:' whether is this, that you cannot sin, or that you do not sin? whether boast you here, of your opinion, or your practice? If the first, take it with you; and that of the apostle, when you say you have not sin, you are liars and the truth is not in you: ^c but if the last, I will tell you, you are now too gross not to be discerned: all your fig-leaves of Purity and Reformation will not cover your nakedness, violence, rebellion, deceit, cruelty, dissimulation, wrath, incharity; in a word, all the titles that attend you in the first [or title] page are your individual lackies, and, do your best, will acknowledge no other master. I have known men of honest, civil, dispositions, ere they joined to your Sect; but then, as if Satan had entered with the sop, immediately became proud, testy, hollow-hearted, and whose charity dared not so much as extend itself to the respects of nature or acquaintance: these, in the children of disobedience, might be accounted sins; what they are in you, I know not!...^d

"Meantime you bear us in hand, you 'are not separate,'—and woe is me, for

^a P. 34.^b P. 35, 36.^c 1 John. i. 8.^d P. 36, 37.

it,—‘from the Civil State, but are peaceable members thereof, subject and obedient to all goodly and just laws,’ how long they may happen to fit your itching humours! Go beyond this train, the ‘laws will be neither ‘good’ nor ‘just;’ you must have the power to interpret them, as you have the ‘Protestation,’ and thereafter obey not them but your fancy concerning them. Here you bring in your ‘fulminatrix legio,’ as if all we were Pagans about you. What your ‘prayers’ have ‘procured’ to us, let these last *thundering* days witness; the almost ruin of a poor Church by your schisms, will testify it to the succeeding ages. The apostle indeed ‘exhorts’ us to pray ‘for kings;’ your hearers know how you obey this exhortation when, by your prayers, you teach them how to suspect their Princes of lukewarmness and oppression in your wavering petitions to God for their reformation, their amendment. As Joab did to Amasa, you stab their ‘authority;’ their reputation, beneath ‘the fifth rib!’^a ‘To your tents, O Israel: What inheritance have we in the son of Jesse?’^b *validior est oris quam operis vox*. Let the condition of the times, your defections, your stirs, speak for me the truth of the matter: if the Parliament should give ear to your desires, royalty might seek a patron amongst the Nominalists: you would soon find that burdensome that is not profitable, and at the last, answer the charges of the Crown with a *Quorsum proditio hæc!* You make too bold with Domitian’s example; blessed be God for it, we have none such, no edicts come out for ‘persecution:’ but it is customary with you, to compare king and people to tyrants and heathen... Kings have no more certainty of your obedience than of your humours; your mutations, at the first change of the weathercock—and you are no less moving,—on information sent you from Amsterdam of a design against the religion, *omnia susque deque miscentur*, all is turned topsy-turvy...^c

“Now when you have drained us of all discipline and unity, how proceed you against the fomentation of envy and faction in the State? You give a bill of divorce to all Ecclesiastical, and a seeming power to all Civil laws; these, say you, may ‘take order with’ transgressors, but with the proviso of incorrigibility: and can there be any such in your ‘exempted Congregations?’ This is either against your doctrine of admission, or perseverance... That ‘old stratagem of Satan,’ you have executed handsomely this year against the Bishops, and with as great moderation as he whom you name did, ‘Nero.’ They, poor men, are by you made the gate to disburden the people of their sins... You tell us ‘the Gospel,’ that *Novum Evangelium* of yours, ‘will kindle coals and stir up debate:’... see how you deal with us here; shall we seem profane to you, you must separate from us; shall you be troublesome and contentious to us, we not from you!... Only you, whom the Conventicle hath assumed to be of the Faithful, have the liberty of the Gospel!...^d

“For your next doubt, that your ‘perfection’ will be envied; it is of your own making. There is none who knows your conversations, can justly charge you with Popery—That *you* intend for Heaven by good works!... You call your way of devotion ‘Christ’s sweetness;’ spare, I entreat you, such appropriations; your works must not ever pass as the works of God...^e

“Now fall you down again upon the Parishes, and maintain a necessity to separate your ‘exempted Congregations’ from them: no minister, you say, will be ‘so unchristian as to envy’ ye this! *Pereunt civili vulnere fratres*: each of you hath his sword in his brother’s side. When will you agree among yourselves? It seems you are erecting the Babel you so much talk of, if the confusion of tongues, hearts, and opinions, be suitable to the work. One calls for an elder, another brings a widow: one will have a parish, another a family: one for the Separation, another against it: this man [holds] that the doctor is an office-bearer; this, that he is not: he for a deaconess, he against her: one says the doctors may excommunicate, another contradicts that; he gives the right of prophesying to the inspired lay-elder, he denies it; another denies all church superiority and jurisdiction; he maintains it in a presbytery; this man, in a parish: *non si linguæ centum, oraque centum—ferrea vox*; and yet all of these,—*mirum dictu!*—leaning to the like immediate, the like infallible, revelation: neither learning, church, nor fathers, must assist to find out the genuine sense of Scripture con-

^a 2 Sam. xx. 10.

^b 1 Kings xii. 16.

^c P. 37—39.

^d P. 39, 40.

^e P. 33.*

cerning any of these! The poets tell us that the mistaken history of Babylon was *Θεομαχέιν*; this, in a two-fold meaning may be so... settle the business among yourselves, and say—you, who maintain the discipline and government of the church to be so clearly and particularly set down in God's word,—hitherto shall our proud wits—that cast up dirt and mire continually—come: then it is possible we may join with you, and that safely too; because you are no more yourselves if you once but listen to unity and concord. But this were dangerous; agreement amongst yourselves might, at the last, end in the Monarchical government of the Church of Rome!.. You tell us that your 'Independent Congregations' will not plead for 'tithes;' now you take the title of Independence upon you, from Church and State; such is the liberty of your family-meetings. Nor will you meddle with 'tithes;' this were—God save us!—to Judaize. It is your custom to ingratiate the people to you by preaching sacrilege, rebellion and usury. King, priest, and people, are too cheap sold for your five-shilling freewill-offering. Nor shall you thus avoid the reward of Balaam; your purchase, it may be is as good as the set rent of others. To live by the chimney-corner, is sometimes as profitable as to live by the altar! Twenty or thirty pounds of collection, is a mean reward for some of your household lectures: even for one exhortation, if some godly families, about midnight, be pleased to join themselves together. That piece of Scripture is practically yours indeed, 'Godliness, is great gain.'^a Nor must the good women,—the conceit of whose devotion, is measured by their reward,—want their oblation, though they should borrow it from the pockets of their sleeping husbands, or send their clothes to Long-lane to fetch it! 'Not many wise,' you can tell us; these are likely to detect your knaveries; but as 'rich' as may be; they will drop the more oil for your zeal, and you, out of your Christian pity, will adventure to disburden them of part of their goods, that they may have the more easy passage 'through the needle's eye.' Your small tithes, you gather them *ipsa corpora* at your chamber conferences and long feasts, which you repay with as long graces, praying to the extent of your belly, where not a morsel may pass your censure if your hand be not in the dish: fastings, unless it be with the Manichæans, upon the Lord's day, fall not out, in your calendar, till the 32nd day of the month!^b

"The 'Parliament,' you tell us, is 'about a Reformation;' a 'glorious work' indeed; God prosper them, and send it us to the rooting out of you and all who have wrought our unquiet, and troubled the peace of Israel... But what Reformation do you conceive? When shall you make a stand? Must every year produce you a new religion? every month a new faith? Nor shall the Rabbies of the next moon be content with what you do: a new inspired-eldership upon a new pretended Revelation will, perhaps, demolish this platform. You have indeed reached home to the first, the Patriarchal; each of them were priests to themselves, so you. Thus it was before the Law, before ceremonies were in custom! and therefore is the only mean for you, who are without all law, to reclaim the church, your household, from ceremonies. You persuade yourself the Parliament will remove that 'Government' you name 'Hierarchical;' and we hope it will not... Those of that Honourable, that Religious Judicature, are lately taught by your madness, that essentially to change the present state of things, were no less than present death to the State... Then, if that dream, that 'idea' of Plato's were made real, did you imagine these noble and conscientious Pilots of this great Body would resign their present tranquillity for the fancies of your distempered humorists?... Go, therefore, with this your conceit, to New England; there convert the Americans from Popery!—every thing beside your own opinion is so to you. We hope never to see this confusion of government, this parity of beings, this annihilation of laws and magistracy, you bring along with you, received with any thing but laughter and derision, in this kingdom... It will be possible to tell you what *Angeli motores*, what great Agents have turned the sphere, and racked their heads, if not their consciences—these, I know they have; I doubt if those,—to advance your ends for their own. I speak no mysteries now; blindness itself hath gotten eyes to see it... Do not you too much rejoice over the—perhaps deserved—afflictions of others: if 'judgment begin at the House of God,'^c what do you expect? The brim of the cup may purge, may refine them: the dregs, plague and confound

^a 1 Tim. vi. 6.^b P. 33*—35.^c 1 Pet. iv. 17.

you... That a 'National Church' hath 'no pattern,' no direction, 'in the Scripture,' is false and scandalous; and because no less repugnant to the position of Consistories than of Bishops, I leave you to their just censures. If you loved peace half so well as you pretend to love truth, this expression had never dropped from your pen... You would gladly purge the 'Universities and Schools:' *non amonimum diligentes*. This vomitive of yours may be the evacuation of their learning and livelihoods... For generosity's sake, invade not your enemy [knowledge] under the cloud, but leave us the title page of two Universities that after ages may know we had once, religion and civility amongst us! You come, at the last, to a strange position, 'It is indifferent' to you, 'whatever Liturgy, or Ceremonies, or Discipline, are left to accompany this National [Church] Government.' Is this you, that told us all these are 'Popish!' It is true you did, but it is the 'Imposition' you only complain of: let you enjoy your 'Christian liberty'—at home in your parlours; and let Mahometism reign in our cathedrals for you!... Give freedom to you, you crave no more: it is therefore not the crimes of the Episcopal office, but because it curbs your passions, your vagaries, that hath stirred your humour against it...^a

"You add, that 'a dangerous error' stiffly maintained, is 'liable to excommunication.' I am glad you grant a possibility of error!... the acknowledgment of a sickness is the first step to health. But how your excommunication 'from other churches' and your exempted 'Independent Congregations' can be soldered together, I profess I understand it not: to me, they seem as contradictory as Independent and not Independent... In your last words, you seem to cast a smile upon 'the Civil Power,' and give a hail to your Master by granting that, in a reflexive way, it may punish the oversights of the fraternity; but if *hypotheca impossibilis equipollet simpliciter neganti*, this is no grant at all. So you speak of such crimes as cannot possibly fall upon any of that sanctification; such as the 'root of apostacy,' and the errors derived from hence: nay, if they did, such faulters were no more of your society, because you are obliged, in conscience, to separate from them! So it is then, that the Magistrate hath not only no power in *Ecclesiasticis*—this is, to you, directly Antichristianism,—but in *Civilibus* neither, to censure any member of your 'exempted and Independent Congregation.' This is the Gideon's fleece that must never be of the common dependence and condition of the rest of the kingdom.^b

"See now what necessity his Sacred Majesty hath—unless he would sell all his possessions—to buy your pearls to curb this feaster [*sic*] of yours. Do not flatter yourselves, his Authority and yours cannot breathe under one climate: your pretended 'freedom' is wholly incompatible with his due obedience,—witness, these sad eclipses, these late storms, these clouds that yet threaten a tempest... Nor deal you more favourably with Parliaments. How much you regard the power, the integrity, of that Most Honourable Court, this your discourse can best give evidence; if you once carried the business, you have professed it, that no law, no statute, shall oblige you further than you find convenient to your 'exempted Congregation'... The spirits of all good men do already groan under your spiritual democracy; and do suffer, aforehand, when their tenderness represents to them the rubbish—unless your violence be prevented—of a demolished Church and State. It is true you are of flint, and the Politicians of the times, who do use you as their stalking-horse from whence to shoot their prey, abundantly furnish tinder; but our prudent King and most careful Parliament shall quench your *ignis fatuus*, and not suffer you to consume us all to ashes. You have been spared hitherto; either to try the length of your arm, how far these your designs would reach, or that the kingdom had not yet collected itself out of that amazement which, by your sudden irruption as that of many rivers, you had caused: but it is now high time to throw full buckets of water upon your fiery heads; to take the matches from you, and either to send you hence or prescribe you bounds; lest that the combustible body about you,—all are now of gunpowder!—take hold of your sparks and burn up all, to the extermination first of order, then of religion, and last of humanity itself. These are the prayers, and these the fears, of all them that with more real sighs and groans than you,—to the hazard of your buttons, employ in charming of your hearers,—love the prosperity and long after the peace of Jerusalem!"^c

^a P. 35*—38^b P. 38,* 39,^c P. 39*—*ad fin.*

The best authentic reply to the scurrility of the attack upon Burton's religious and political principles, for the present occasion, is perhaps gathered from "A most Godly Sermon: Preached at St. Alban's, in Wood Street, on Sunday last, being the 10th of October, 1641. Showing the Necessity of Self-denial and Humiliation, by Prayer and Fasting before the Lord; in regard of the present plague we now lie under: which God, in his good time remove from amongst us.—By that faithful Minister and Witness of Jesus Christ, Mr. Henry Burton.—1641." 4to. pp. [7.]

From the text in Luke ix. 23, "Let him deny himself," Burton deduces three relations, "a natural, a civil, a sensitive." On the second, he founds this doctrine, "a Christian must 'deny himself' in all civil relation: if princes or states make laws against the law of Christ, against his religion and his pure ordinances, threatening punishment to those that will not observe them; herein a true Christian must 'deny himself' both in matter of terror and in matter of favour. In matter of terror, whatsoever is threatened against a man—Matt. x. 28—a Christian may say, I am lower than all the terrors of the world can hurt me! We should 'deny' ourselves with Paul, and be 'ready' not only to be bound but to die for Christ, Acts xxi. 13. Theodorus, a heathen man, was told that he should not rot above ground; I care not, saith he, it is all one to me to rot above or under ground. Thus a Christian should resolve against all fears and terror whatsoever, for Christ. So for matter of favour, as Polycarpus [who] had great promotion promised in the time of persecution, answered, 'I have served Christ forty [years,] and he hath always been a good master to me, and I will not deny Him now:' this is self-denial. How many have been overcome with these things for want of [such] self-denial! Those that are compelled to popery and popish ways, are not Christ's followers, but the followers of Antichrist.

"Objection: Some may say, What need we to have such a doctrine as this of self-denial, in respect of civil relation, to be taught us now? Answer: First, God be thanked, it is true the storm is over of this oppressing; yet this doctrine may be very useful for this very season. We are in the expectation of a true Reformation; and in the very Reformation, self-denial is to be used. Secondly, If some by Reformation be reformed, and not *others*; will *they* be quiet? No! the nearer we come to Christ, the more we must look for 'persecution!' 2 Tim. iii. 12. Let us not look for a true, powerful, Reformation of Religion without persecution." ^a

CHAP. XL.

LETTER TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—ANSWER.—T. EDWARDS.—CHIDLEY.

We are now indeed entered upon that most extraordinary period when the contest for supremacy actually commenced between the legitimate and foster children of a paralytic "Mother." And we are able to show in what way the, as yet, subdued portion of her offspring dealt, to court and to repress any who threatened to curb their ambition by controverting the equity of their pretensions. The annexed Letters will speak for themselves on this point, and prove beyond dispute, *who* appealed for authoritative succour to remove "the yoke of Episcopacy."

"A Letter from some Ministers in England, to the Assembly."^b

"Right Reverend and dear Brethren, now convened in this General Assembly:—We most heartily salute you in the Lord, rejoicing with you in his unspeakable goodness so miraculously prospering your late endeavours, both for the restoring and settling of your own liberties and

^a P. 3—5.


^b In Scotland.

privileges in Church and Commonwealth, which we hear and hope He is now about to accomplish ; as, also, for the occasioning and advancing the work of Reformation among ourselves ; for which, as we daily bless the highest Lord, sole Author of all our good, so do we acknowledge yourselves worthy instruments thereof. And for that, besides all other respects, we do, and ever shall, by the help of God, hold you dear unto us as our own bowels, and ourselves obliged to render unto you all due correspondence, according to our power, upon all good occasions.

“ And now, dear Brethren, forasmuch as the Church of Christ is but one body, each part whereof cannot but partake in the weal and woe of the whole, and of each other part ; and these Churches, of England and Scotland, may seem both to be embarked in the same bottom, to sink and swim together, and are so near conjoined by many strong ties ; not only as fellow members under the same Head, Christ, and fellow subjects under the same King, but also, by such neighbourhood and vicinity of place that if any evil shall much infest the one, the other cannot be altogether free ; or if for the present it should, yet, in process of time, it would sensibly suffer also. And forasmuch as evils are better remedied in their first beginning than after they have once taken deep root ; therefore we whose names are here underwritten, in the behalf of ourselves and of many others, ministers of the Church of England, are bold to commend to your consideration—being met together in this venerable Assembly, a difference of great concernment ; which you may please, in brief, thus to understand :

“ Almighty God having now, of his infinite goodness, raised up our hopes of removing the yoke of Episcopacy, under which we so long groaned, sundry other forms of Church Government are, by sundry sorts of men, projected to be set up in the room thereof. One of which, amongst others, is of some Brethren that hold, The whole power of Church Government, and all acts thereunto appertaining,—as election, ordination, and deposition of officers ; with admission, excommunication, and absolution of members ;—are, by divine Ordinance *in foro externo*, to be decreed by the most voices, in and of every particular Congregation, which, say they, is the utmost bound of a Particular Church, endued with power of Government ; and only some formalities, of solemn execution, to be reserved to the officers,—as servants of the said Church,—if they have any, or if none, then to be performed by some other members not in office whom the said Church shall appoint thereunto. And that every of the said particular Congregations, whether they consist of few or many members, and be furnished with officers or not, lawfully may, and ought, to transact, determine, and execute, all matters pertaining to the government of themselves amongst and within themselves, without any authoritative—though not consultatory—concurrence or interposition of any other persons or churches whatsoever ; condemning all imperative and decisive power of Classes, or compound Presbyteries and Synods, as a mere usurpation.

“ Now because we conceive that your judgment in this case, may conduce much, by the blessing of God, to the settling of this question amongst us, therefore we do earnestly entreat the same at your hands ; and that so much the rather, because we sometimes hear from those of



the aforesaid judgment, that some famous and eminent Brethren, even amongst yourselves, do somewhat incline unto an approbation of that way of government. Thus, humbly craving pardon for our boldness, leaving the matter to your grave considerations, and expecting answer at your convenient leisure, we commit you and the success of this your meeting, to the blessing of the Almighty, in whom we shall ever remain—Your faithful Brethren, to serve you in all offices of love. London, 12 July, 1641.”

“The Assembly’s Answer to the English Ministers’ Letter.

“Right Reverend and dearly beloved Brethren in our Lord and common Saviour, Jesus Christ.—We, the Ministers and Elders met together in this National Assembly, were not a little refreshed and comforted by the good report which we heard of you and others of our Brethren of the Kirk of England, by some of our Ministers who, by the good providence of our Lord, had seen your faces and conversed with you: But now yet more comforted by your Letters which we received, and which were read in the face of the Assembly, witnessing your Christian love, and rejoicing with us in God for his great and wonderful work in the Reformation of this Kirk; and in the beginning of a blessed Reformation amongst yourselves, and that you are so sensible of your communion and fellowship with us, as to desire to know our mind and judgment of that which some Brethren amongst you hold concerning Kirk-government.

“We do, with our hearts, acknowledge and wonder at the great and unspeakable wisdom, mercy, and power of our God, in restoring unto us the truth and purity of religion, after many backslidings, and defection of some in this Kirk; and desire not only to confess the same before the world, and all other Christian Kirks, but also do pray for grace to walk worthy of so wonderful a love. . . We have learned, by long experience, ever since the time of Reformation, and specially after the two kingdoms have been, in the great goodness of God to both, united under one Head and Monarch, but most of all of late, which is not unknown to you,—what dangers and contagion in matters of Kirk-government, of divine worship, and of doctrine, may come from the one Kirk to the other; which, beside all other reasons, makes us to pray to God, and to desire you and all that love the honour of Christ and the peace of these Kirks and kingdoms, heartily to endeavour that there might be in both Kirks one Confession, one Directory for Public Worship, one Catechism, and one Form of Kirk-government. And if the Lord, who hath done great things for us, shall be pleased to hearken unto our desires, and to accept of our endeavours, we shall not only have a sure foundation for a durable peace, but shall be strong in God against the rising or spreading of Heresy and Schism amongst ourselves, and of invasion from foreign enemies.

“Concerning the different Forms of Kirk-government, projected ‘by sundry sorts of men,’ to be set up in place of Episcopal Hierarchy, which, we trust, is brought near unto its period; we must confess that we are not a little grieved that any godly Ministers and Brethren should be found who do not agree with other Reformed Kirks in the point of government as well as in the matter of doctrine and worship; and, that

we want not our own fears that where the hedge of discipline and government is different, the doctrine and worship shall not long continue the same without change: yet, do not marvel much that particular Kirks and Congregations, which live in such places as that they can, conveniently, have no dependency upon superior Assemblies, should stand for a kind of independency and supremacy in themselves; they not considering that in a nation or kingdom professing the same religion, the government of the Kirk by compound Presbyteries and Synods is a help and strength, and not a hindrance or prejudice to particular Congregations and Elderships, in all the parts of Kirk-government; and, that Presbyteries and Synods are not an extrinsical power set over particular kirks, like unto episcopal dominion; they being no more to be reputed extrinsical unto the particular kirks, nor [than] the power of a Parliament or Convention of Estates, where the shires and cities have their own delegates, is to be held extrinsical to any particular shire or city.

“ Our unanimous judgment and uniform practice is that, according to the order of the Reformed Kirks and the Ordinance of God in his Word, not only the solemn execution of ecclesiastical power and authority, but the whole acts and exercise thereof, do properly belong unto the officers of the Kirk; yet so that, in matters of chiefest importance, the tacit consent of the congregation be had, before their decrees and sentences receive final execution: and that the officers of a particular congregation may not exercise this power independently, but with subordination unto greater Presbyteries and Synods, provincial and national. . . In this form of Kirk-government, our unanimity and harmony, by the mercy of God, is so full and perfect that all the members of this Assembly have declared themselves to be of one heart and of one soul, and to be no less persuaded that it is of God, than that Episcopal-government is of men; resolving, by the grace of God, to hold the same constantly, all the days of our life; and heartily wishing that God would bless all the Christian Kirks,—especially the famous Kirk of England, unto which, in all other respects, we are so nearly joined,—with this Divine form of government. . .—Subscribed by our Moderator and Clerk. Edinburgh, 9 August, 1641.”^a

From the “Ministers,” collectively, we turn to an individual among them, whose hostility against resistance was alike rancorous and persevering, though not successful.

“Reasons against the Independent Government of Particular Congregations: As also, against the Toleration of such Churches to be erected in this Kingdom. Together with an Answer to such Reasons as are commonly alleged for such a Toleration.—Presented, in all Humility, to the Honourable House of Commons, now Assembled in Parliament.—By Tho. Edwards, Minister of the Gospel.—1 Cor. xii. 21. Rom. xvi. 17.—1641.” 4to. pp. 56.

Reminding “the Honourable the Knights, Citizens, and Burgeses,” in his *long* “Epistle Dedicatory,” of the effects produced by the

^a “A True Copy of the whole printed Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland. Beginning at the Assembly holden at Glasgow the 27th Nov. 1638, and ending at the Assembly holden at Edinburgh the 6th day of August 1649. Printed 1682.” 12mo. p. 103, 105.

“Sacramentary Controversy” at the commencement of the Reformation, and of that “now, in our days, . . . fitly termed ‘the Disciplinary Controversy;’ Edwards bursts out, “Oh there is such a fire kindled in this kingdom about these points! . . . It is the duty of all the sons of Sion to endeavour, in their places, the putting out this fire before it go too far as by pouring out buckets of tears, etc.” He represents that “strong resolutions” have been “stirred up” in himself to lay out himself “for the healing of this Schism and quenching this Fire!” It will be shown in the course of our labours that no “minister of the Gospel” ever more completely missed his aim.

“Now the first born of this kind,”—of “strong resolutions,” we suppose he means,—“though not the first conceived, is this present treatise.” And he strangely excuses his “boldness” towards their “Honours,” for asking them to help him to quench “this Fire,” “seeing that by you, under God, and the King’s most excellent majesty, *I*, and hundreds of *my* Brethren, enjoy so great quietness and freedom in *our* Ministry, estates, persons, after so great a storm; and that very worthy deeds are done both to us and to this nation; . . . and here I offer to you the first fruits of my labours, as a lasting monument of gratitude!” He betrays however, immediately, forebodings respecting the success of his adventure, and calls for a fresh motive for “gratitude” in their “Honours” protection; “That by presenting it to You, both myself and book might here take sanctuary, and have your protection against the many calumnies and reproaches which will be cast upon us from that spirit of Separation! . . . I have long ago given my back to the smiters, and, by the grace of Christ, hope to bear all calumnies with much quietness of spirit. . . . I therefore present this work to your Honours, and put it under your shadow, that so your countenance and acceptance of it, according as you find it, may counterbalance and weigh down with all sorts of men, the calumnies and censures cast upon it to hinder that good intended by it; and may the more commend the Work to make it take with many for their satisfaction!”

It had been prudent if Edwards’s “quietness of spirit” had prevented him from beseeching their “Honours” not to “cast an eye upon the errors and evils” of Anabaptism, Brownism, etc., “how to hinder their growth;” and it was certainly not very seemly in him to bring his patrons into such nearness or juxtaposition with “the Devil;” who, he tells their “Honours,” “seeing he cannot effect his ends in the former ways he went, will now try others. . . . Satan is now transforming himself from an angel of darkness into an angel of light. . . . In a word, plainly to express my meaning, one extremity hath caused another. The tyranny of Episcopal Government in some Bishops, hath brought forth the Democracy, and Independency! The violent pressing of some pretended Orders,^a hath set many against all order. And Satan seeing he cannot do as he did; the times not favouring those things; . . . he now goes about by other ways. . . . Independency will bring again what now it would cast out; namely, libertinism, profaneness, errors: and will, by some removes, bring many men to be of no religion at all! Be pleased,

^a Alluding to ‘Laud’s’ new Canons.

most worthy Senators, to let me tell you, that the greatest sort of erroneous spirits with all unstable and wanton-witted men, will be much for Independent Government, and Toleration; and be to their uttermost against Synods, and settled Government. . . And however in many men who be principal actors in this way of Independency, the dangers and evils may not so appear for the present, there being many things in *most* of the Ministers *lovely*, which the more commends this way! . . . And, I humbly crave leave to tell you, that delays, . . . will prove very dangerous; many falling to that way daily. . . Besides, the Independents lie at the catch and advantage of delays; all their hopes and strength standing in this, That it will be long before there be a Synod; or before the Church-government be settled. Hoping that in the interim, . . . they may both gather and increase their churches, and make their party more considerable; and there is just ground to think, they are not wanting to endeavour, by some instruments, how to effect it. 'The hand of Joab'^a is sometimes where it is not dreamt of! . . . But it is time for me to take off my hand, lest the porch be too large for the house."

In a *short* "Introduction," Edwards writes, "That which first moved me to the drawing up of these Reasons, . . . was, the credible information given me of some Petitions, drawn to be presented to the Honourable House of Commons,^b for a Toleration of some Congregations to enjoy an Independent Government; and to be exempt from the Government which *shall be* established by Law. . . Considering, how many there are of that way; some inhabiting in this Kingdom; others, who are come over into England on purpose, being sent as 'messengers of their churches,'^c to negotiate in that behalf: and, observing, how diligently and close they follow it, by daily attending at Westminster; by insinuating themselves into the company of sundry Members of the House of Commons; by preaching often at Westminster, the more to ingratiate themselves and their cause: printing, also, their desire of a Toleration for Independent Government; and that, with casting of dirt upon the Reformation and Government of this National Church, whatever it may be,—as witness 'The Protestation Protested,'—I, a Minister of the Gospel, and a sufferer for it these many years past, . . . have thought it my duty, . . . to print these Reasons at this time, that so, when any of those Petitions come to be propounded in the House of Commons, under specious pretences and fair pretexts, there may by these Reasons appear 'a snake under the green grass!' . . . My aim therefore, is, . . . to present to the House a Writ of 'Ne admittas,' fetcht out from the Court of Heaven, and from the Records of the Holy Scripture."

Proceed we in due order, then, to Edwards's eight "Reasons against Independency." And the first may be gathered from its conclusion: "The Churches, in the apostles' times, were Churches in Cities; it being all one, to say in every city, or in every church;^d which churches also had good store of preaching ministers amongst them, as appears by Acts, xiii. 1; xx. 36, 37, compared with verse 28. So that in all cases of doctrine and discipline, having many ministers to resolve and determine matters,

^a 2 Sam. xiv. 19.

^b On the margin of the copy before us, is written, "I was moved in that cause."

^c 2 Cor. viii. 23.

^d Tit. i. 5; Acts. xiv. 23.

and to have carried them with the more gravity and authority ; they might have subsisted the better Independently : whereas most Particular Congregations now, have but few ministers, one or two ;—nay, according to their principles, there may be none, nor no officer at all ;—and yet these Congregations must be Independent, having all power and government independently, before Officers as well as after."

The second "Reason" is a vague effort to exalt the power of Presbyterial Ordination ; and, an ignorant assumption of the inability of a Community of Saints to elect and set apart officers, from among themselves.

The third is alike futile ; resting the necessity of a Court of Appeal on the precedent of the church at Antioch, Acts xv. ; but forgetting, that they were not members of that church, who caused the "dissention and disputation." This was brought about by the intrusion of the "certain men which came from Judea ;" even "certain which went out" from the church at Jerusalem and who "troubled them with words, subverting their souls !" ^a How, then, does that precedent establish an authoritative jurisdiction by the one church, over Christians not of its own vicinity, sending merely for information concerning a disputed practice of the other church ? Hence, what is there to debar Independent Churches from deputing parties to seek an explanation of another similar Church, concerning such like impertinent intruders ; and from receiving back a civil apology, even though it be accompanied with a piece of extraneous advice ? Besides, this alleged precedent makes against its adducers, since it does not appear that the church in Antioch commissioned its messengers to unite in any act of discipline against those who "went out" from the church at Jerusalem !

Edwards's fourth "Reason," on behalf of Synods being concordant with reason and with "the law of nature," makes no better progress ; for as there was nothing to prevent them formerly, so has not experience shown since, that Independent Churches combine when their interests are sufficiently concerned ?

Alike feeble is the argumentation in the fifth "Reason," abounding as it does in assumptions, and in mis-matching the premises and conclusion : ' Now if ' the spirits of the prophets ' ^b in a particular congregation, must be ' subject ' to the censure of the rest in that church ; then, by way of equity and analogy, they are to be subjected to a greater company, namely, to the judgment of all the prophets in a province, or nation ! "

His negative argument, in the sixth "Reason," that Synods are "nowhere forbidden by God, in the New Testament," may be safely conceded.

The seventh "Reason" is founded on the admission that "this consociation and combination by way of Synods is granted by themselves as lawful and expedient in sundry cases and particulars ;" whence he would have Independents conclude with himself "that the judging and determining of Censures, and the imposition of Orders and Decrees, may be warrantable. !"

But the eighth "Reason" is truly the climax of all that is unreason-

^a Acts xv. 24.

^b 1 Cor. xiv. 32.

able: Officers and churches may excommunicate from their own bodies lawfully, *ergo* "then they may excommunicate members of other congregations!"

Now for the peroration: "Many other Reasons against Independency, I could subjoin to these; as that it overthrows communion of Saints! as the impossibility of this Government to any Christian Commonwealth or Nation; etc.! Besides, the taking of all their evasions to these Reasons, which I easily know and foresee; as also, an answer to all their arguments and reasons for Independency: But intending this only for a light skirmish, before I draw up my forces to the main battle; and sending this forth but as a scout, to discover the strength or weakness of the other side; I will add no more, only that I do not fear but that these few soldiers will be able to return again alive and unwounded; and be able to do more service when they shall be joined with others and formed into *battalio*!" Admirable composer of differences; and worthy deviser of a most sure expedient "for the healing of this Schism, and quenching this Fire!"

Concerning the second part of this treatise by Edwards, *The Reasons against a Toleration*; we should let it remain in that entire oblivion into which common sense and the Laws of the Land have inevitably sunk it, were we not, from our undertaking, compelled to show the spirit which they who advocate a State Religion, of any kind, have been driven to exemplify.

Edwards puts the question here, "Is it fitting that well meaning Christians should be suffered to go and make churches, and then proceed to choose whom they will for Ministers; as some tailor, felt-maker, button-maker,—men ignorant and low in parts; by whom they shall be led into sin and errors, and to forsake the public assemblies where they may enjoy worthy and precious Pastors after God's own heart, who would feed them with knowledge and understanding?"^a If once there be a Toleration of churches, it will be thus; but if they be hindered of all meetings, this would be prevented!"^b Whatever regrets may be justly indulged and expressed lest "well meaning Christians" should be misguided; it is equally a cause of regret, that any Christian who has acquired that learning which a "tailor, felt-maker," or "button maker," may be supposed not to possess, should be so unenlightened withal as to strive to interpose human authority in matters of combined Worship where the Divine Master has proclaimed that He will, without limitation, condescend to preside "in the midst" of any "two or three" where or wheresoever "on earth" they shall be gathered together in his "Name."^c We accept Edwards's testimony, that "many of the People, who yet be not in this Church-way for their practice, are yet much possessed with these principles of the Independent way, as the only way of God, and are much looking towards it."^d

He affirms that "Toleration will not only breed divisions and schisms, disturbing the peace and quiet of churches and towns; . . . but disturbance, discontent, and divisions in the same families:"^e and he represents "some" of the Independents as holding "that saints when they die, go not to heaven where Christ is, but they go to a third place;" and that they

^a Jer. iii. 15.^b P. 23.^c Matt. xviii. 19, 20.^d P. 24.^e P. 26.

practise “the sitting with their hats on at the receiving of the Lord’s Supper.”^a If Toleration be granted, he continues, “the most eminent ministers in this kingdom for parts, grace, and labours,” meaning those of his own sect, the Presbyterians, will “have little assurance of the continuance of their flocks to them.” We may imagine with what a heavy heart he tells “their Honours” “We see within this nine months, though there be no Toleration for their way; yet, having not been looked after, how are they increased and multiplied!”^b Referring to what was the state of affairs under the Episcopalians, he proceeds thus; “In many, if not in most towns and parishes, it cannot be helped but that there are and will be for many years, men of no great popular gifts for preaching; who also according to their principles not having been brought up to it, cannot so combine with their people; now, many that live in these parishes, . . upon the news of a Toleration, will, for the benefit of more powerful, practical, and zealous preaching, betake themselves to go to their [Independent] churches; which liberty they cannot have in the churches established, for the Law, it is likely, will provide for men to keep to their own ministers where there is sufficient preaching;—and so will fall to their principles; and so we shall have upon this ground swarms of them.”^c

So conformable is Edwards, that he wilfully confounds the spiritual policy of a church whose only Head is Christ, with the temporal policy and civil supremacy of the chief magistrate;^d not choosing at this time to remember, that our Lord himself has taught us to make a distinction between “the things” of Cæsar and “the things” of God;^e and, notwithstanding, also, the practices recorded in the Acts of the Apostles for our instruction. He adduces the example of New England, and of some churches at home;^f overlooking that the former erred from a partial recoil of what some in Lancashire, who might favour Edwards’s anti-toleration principles, and who, provided they did not succeed in procuring themselves to be the established party at home were anticipating a sojourn in America, would convey thither also the residuum of their noxious principles; and not noticing even the absurdity of his own allegation, that “the Godliest Christians,” as he calls them, who would neither “enter into Covenant, profess their faith, nor submit to their church orders,” should be *anti-tolerant* indeed to claim to be received of any church, at home or abroad!

That “all the rigid ‘Brownists’ of the kingdom,” and all “other sectaries,” as being “persuaded” that the Presbyterians “are no true church,” may move for Toleration upon “better grounds” than “these semi-separatists,”^g meaning the Independents; while it shows that Edwards knew when to make a distinction, which he finds it convenient to overlook at other times, adds no weight to his reasoning. Of what value that is, may be inferred from his representing a collection of saints who had separated themselves from the world into the fellowship of the Gospel, as making way for all manner of evils, because some three or four of them may, when offended, withdraw, “and be a church.”^h And his queries respecting the limitation of the number of

^a P. 27.^b P. 28.^c P. 29.^d P. 30.^e Matt. xxii. 21.^f P. 32.^g P. 33.^h P. 34.

churches to be tolerated, if conceded, with the difficulty likely to ensue after a division shall have occurred, to decide which section "is the church allowed of by the state,"^a serve only to show now-a-days what kind of perplexities were matter of grave consideration to our ancestors.

Having advanced his own several Reasons, Edwards comes to "answer" five or six "that be commonly alleged by them for their Toleration." We desist from accompanying him throughout, because the events of time have produced the best possible answer, in the success of the principles of Toleration, and in the vast multiplication of Independent churches; accompanied by the very result Edwards dreaded so much, the almost utter extinction in England of the Presbyterian Discipline, so earnestly and bitterly contended to be that which is pre-eminently *jure divino*!

"Some of your Ministers, at first coming over, said, as I have been told from good hands, They could take the charge of Parochial churches amongst us upon the Reformation hoped for; and, They could yield to Presbyterian government, by Classes and Synods, so not enjoined to submit to it as *jure divino*:^b but since they have gotten some more hopes, I know not upon what grounds, they are now very hot for a Toleration, and will not hear of growing into one body with us."^c This proves that the Independents were considerate and cautious; and they would doubtless be disposed to smile at Edwards's betrayal of his simplicity where he demands, "Why can you not bear with some defects in our churches, and be content to wait some years, till God either give you light to see your mistakes, or else till we have more light to perfect what is wanting?"^d

In another place, Edwards could hide his spleen no longer, but gave vent to the following characteristic passage: "They may draw away many good people; especially if the ceremonies and the liturgy stand in full force, and their churches tolerated, they will make brave work in a short time. Though I am confident God will preserve many judicious advised Christians from their way, notwithstanding. But let there be no Toleration granted, and they once well shipt! and a Reformation amongst us in Government and Ministers, that fear is over with me! We fear it not, that many will follow them; for when that which first bred these men, the violent pressing of ceremonies, the casting out of good ministers, the many notorious persons suffered in the church [of England] without all censure, shall be removed, many will not be bred, and others will be satisfied; and I doubt it not, but that the godly and painful ministers of the [Presbyterian] Church of England may, and will, both out-preach them and out-live them; and may be compared with them for all excellencies and abilities. For my part, I shall speak as I find;—I knew many of them long before they fell to this way, and know them since, and have not seen any of them better,

^a P. 35.

^b "The 'divine right' of Episcopacy was then valiantly asserted, when he who would have been respondent must have bethought himself withal how he could refute the Clink or the Gatehouse [prisons.]" Milton's Apology for Smectymnuus. Sect. ii. *fn.* Might not the same be said *nomine mutato*, against the Party for whom Edwards is pleading?

^c P. 39.

^d P. 41.

or more profitable in life and ministry, for their change. Only this I am sure of, for some of them, whereas whilst of the Church of England they preacht often, now seldomer; they go looser in their apparel and hair; they take less care for the public in things that concern the glory of God and salvation of men's souls; their principles and spirits grow very narrow like their churches; they grow more strange, reserved, subtile; in a word, they mind little else but the propagation of their Independent way, as 'the Protestation Protested' witnesseth abundantly.^a And I shall speak my conscience; from the experience I have had of many of them, having studied and observed them and their writings, and never saw nor heard of any man who fell fully to that way that ever had so large a spirit for good afterwards, to take that care of propagating the Gospel, and preaching the word to men without; I never knew any man that ever God honoured so much after he fell to those principles as before. Though the same persons before have been active for God, doing famously and worthily, yet when they fall to this way, they either blemish themselves, or do little. And the truth is, those principles of separation be such as God did never honour much the men who hold them. Look, what is said by them of Episcopacy, 'That the very calling of it hath such a malignity in it that it hurts the best men that are placed in those chairs;' that, I may say truly of this way, There is a malignity cleaves to it; hurting the men that fall to it, by altering their spirits and contracting their hearts: though many of them continue good in the main!"^b

"And thus I have delivered my own soul; hoping that either our Brethren will withdraw their Petitions, so as they shall never be read in the Honourable House of Commons; or if they should, I hope the House will cast them out;^c for I am persuaded it shall never be said of this Parliament in the ages to come, that they were the first that opened a door for Tolerations, and for setting up of churches against the Church; which, if ever that door should be opened, which God of his infinite mercy keep shut, I leave it to their great wisdoms to foresee what infinite evils would, in process of time, come upon this kingdom."^d

The above passage commences his last paragraph; we are now arrived at its termination: "The day is shortly coming that will try all; and I rejoice in the thoughts of it, in regard of the accounts I shall give about this controversy of Separation. Nothing doubting, but that in that great day, Christ, of his rich grace pardoning my weaknesses that have, may, and do, cleave to me in the manner of managing it, will own my whole work and endeavours against that way of Separa-

^a "And whatever liturgy, or ceremonies, or discipline, are left to accompany this National Church Government, it is indifferent with us, so as we may enjoy our Christian liberty in the true use of such Ordinances, and of such Independent Government as Christ the only Lawgiver of his Church, and Lord of the conscience, hath left unto us in his Word."

^b P. 48.

^c On the margin is written, in the same hand as before, see back, p. 102, b., "The votes against that book discouraged Petitions of this Kind; for all the industry that they used could not save that book 'The Protestation Protested.'"

^d P. 55.

tion, as stirred up by his own Spirit; and followed all along by his Spirit enabling me in it, and to it, above my own strength. And, though I expect many censures and reproaches from that sort of men, yet then I shall have praise with God, and the reward of all my labour for truth, love, peace, and holiness, which I aim at in this and all other Discourses about this controversy."

Some insight has just been given into the incipient productions of one who styled himself a "minister of the Gospel," but of whom it is no misrepresentation to declare that his mind and his pen overflowed with "the gall of bitterness."^a Proud, wrathful, and implacable, he has also obtained an inglorious immortality from Milton's compellation of "shallow" Edwards! We shall be constrained to bring him before the reader in our subsequent pages; in the present, we record "The Justification of the Independent Churches of Christ. Being an Answer to Mr. Edwards his Book, which he hath written against the Government of Christ's Church, and Toleration of Christ's Public Worship: Briefly declaring, That the Congregations of the Saints ought not to have Dependency in Government upon any other, or Direction in Worship from any other, than Christ, their Head and Law-Giver. By Katherine Chidley. 1 Sam. xvii. 45. Judges iv. 21. 1641." 4to. pp. 81.

Of all divines then living, none would, perhaps, have so contemned, as Edwards, the very idea of being encountered in print by a woman. And mortifying indeed must it have been to him to be divested of his imagined supremacy, and reduced to the base level of one of those on whom he had bestowed his gratuitous vituperation.^b "Though Mr. Edwards boasts himself here, to be a minister of the Gospel, and a sufferer for it, yet," says his feminine antagonist, "I challenge him to prove unto me, that he hath any calling or ordination to the ministry but that which he hath successively from Rome! If he lay claim to that, he is one of the Pope's household: but if he deny that calling, then is he as void of a calling to the work of the ministry, and as void of ordination, as any of those ministers whom he calleth 'Independent men,' which have cast off the ordination of the Prelates; and consequently as void of ordination as a mechanical tradesman!"^c This must have been a real discomfiter at the outset. And notwithstanding Edwards had, as we have seen,^d put himself fully *en order de bataille*, no sooner does his present opponent fairly meet him than she accosts him: "Mr. Edwards,—understanding that you are a mighty champion, and now mustering up your mighty forces, as you say; and I, apprehending they must come against the host of Israel, and hearing the armies of the Living God so defied by you, could not be withheld, but that I, instead of a better, must needs give you the meeting."^e

She then falls upon his first two "Reasons," and having finished them, makes proclamation, "The greatest champions which you have sent out in this skirmish, are now both slain;... for they were made most of suppositions, and of things that appeared unto you by likelihood; without any ground from the Scriptures... Now these two

^a Acts viii. 23.

^b See back. p. 104.

^c "Answer to his Introduction."

^d See back, p. 104.

^e P. 1.

being thus turned aside by one of the meanest of all the army of Jesus Christ, you may justly fear that all the rest of your soldiers will run away wounded!"^a

On part of the third "Reason," she reminds her opponent, "Whereas you affirm, That the church of Antioch, Acts xv. 'judged it unequal' to decide the case among themselves: . . . this chapter, above all the chapters that I can find, proves Independency, upon your own ground, That the church of Antioch judged it an 'unequal' thing for them to judge the members of the church of Jerusalem! And by this, you may perceive how you have erred, not knowing the Scriptures; or else you have done worse, in labouring to darken the truth by evasions, or false glosses."^b

She proceeds, under the fourth "Reason;" "That the Government of Independent churches 'is against the light of nature' and 'right reason;' this I have denied and disproved sufficiently already."^c

At the fifth, she remarks that, "In the particular congregation of Colosse, Paul beheld a comely 'order,' notwithstanding there were no Synod consisting of any but only the members and ministers of that congregation. . .^d Now, if you can show us in the Scriptures any general command, That all the churches should; or any example, That all the churches did, gather a Council of some ministers out of every particular congregation, to make Decrees or Laws to impose upon the whole; then you will speak something to the purpose; but as yet, you have not spoken one word that proveth any such thing. And whereas you allege that Scripture that 'The spirits of the prophets' must be 'subject to the prophets;'^e I answer, That that is given to particular congregations, and therefore not to all in a province or nation, and so not to Synods. . . The church of Jerusalem did nothing without the counsel of the Spirit; neither determined of anything that was not written in the Scripture. So the churches of God now ought to presume to do nothing but what the written Word allows them; being taught the true meaning thereof by the Spirit that God hath given them."^f

"In your sixth Reason, you affirm, That 'the Government of the church by Synods, is nowhere forbidden by God in the New Testament, either directly or by consequence.' But I do affirm the contrary, and prove it thus; That whatsoever Government is not commanded by God is accursed; and that is plainly manifested in the New Testament, Rev. xxii. 18. But your Government by Synods is not commanded by God, and therefore it is accursed."^g

On the seventh "Reason," she answers, "Though all should confess, That it is *profitable* to have the counsels of their brethren, and neighbour churches, in doubtful cases, yet this will be far from proving the *lawfulness* of your Synods."^h

Having said, in his eighth "Reason," That this "Government of Independency, overthroweth the Communion of Saints," Edwards is met thus; "This appears to be contrary, by that which hath been said already: as for example, the difference between the church of Antioch

^a P. 9.^b P. 10.^c P. 12.^d Col. ii. 5.^e 1 Cor. xiv. 32.^f P. 12—14.^g P. 15.^h P. 17.

and the church of Jerusalem turned to good, because they undertook not the authority to determine the case themselves, as hath been said; because it was against the members of the church of Jerusalem. And, this increased union and communion in both churches, as we may plainly see; for Peter communicated unto them what God had revealed unto him; and Paul and Barnabas declared what God had done by them: James calls them back to consider what Peter had declared; and backs it with the Scripture, manifesting how it agreed with the words of the prophets, as you may read at large in Acts xv. Thus you may see what sweet Communion was between these churches that were both Independent! Now, whereas you say, it [this Independent Government] ‘cannot be in a Christian Commonwealth or Nation;’ I do affirm it may stand with Christ’s Church in a Commonwealth; as may plainly appear in the first three chapters of the Revelation, which testify that there were ‘seven churches in Asia;’ and these seven churches were compared to ‘seven golden candlesticks,’^a and every candlestick stood by itself and held forth her own light; as appears by those several messages which were sent to those ‘seven churches.’ For had they had a dependency one upon another in respect of power, then one message would have served unto them all; and what sin any of the ‘churches,’ or ‘angels,’ were guilty of, would have been laid unto the charge of all the churches and angels; but we see it was otherwise. As for instance, there was none charged for suffering the woman Jezebel to teach the people ‘to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols,’ but the angel of Thyatira;^b by this, you may plainly see there was not one angel set over them all; nor one Synod appointed to judge and correct them all; which is the thing you labour for! Yet it cannot be said, that the Independency of these seven churches hindered their Communion either with Christ their Head, or one with another; neither was it any disturbance to the Commonwealth, or Nation, wherein they lived. And here, you cannot say, that I have evaded, but have answered you directly, to these your doubts and suppositions; and to many of your ‘ifs’ which have been your spies sent out in this scout. And moreover, I will answer all your many ‘Reasons’ as I come to them; though they be joined in battle with these!”^c

“Now I have proved the Independent Government to be Christ’s Government: I will also prove, in my answers to these your following Reasons, That the Independent Congregations perform Christ’s Public Worship, and therefore ought to be tolerated, and maintained in the practice thereof.”^d

To Edwards’s question respecting “well-meaning Christians” making churches,^e the answer is prompt; “It is fitting, .. if they are well-meaning Christians; but ill-meaning Priests are very unfit to make churches, because what they build up with one hand, they pull down with the other!”^f

To his exclamation, under this third Reason, “Oh, how will this [toleration] take away that power and authority which God hath given

^a Rev. i. 20.

^b Rev. ii. 18.

^c P. 19.

^d P. 20.

^e See back, p. 104.

^f P. 22.

to husbands, fathers, and masters, over wives, children, and servants!" the answer is, "Oh, that you would consider the text in 1 Cor. vii. which plainly declares that the wife may be a believer and the husband an unbeliever! But if you have considered this text, I pray you tell me, What 'authority' this unbelieving husband hath over the conscience of his believing wife? It is true he hath authority over her in bodily and civil respects, but not to be a lord over her conscience. And the like may be said of fathers and masters. . . It is granted that the king hath 'power,' according to the law, over the bodies, goods, and lives, of all his subjects; yet it is Christ, the King of kings, that reigneth over their consciences. And thus you may see, it [toleration] taketh away no 'authority which God hath given' to them. . . The Court of Parliament, to whom you submit for judgment, may easily see that good members both for churches and commonwealths, may issue out of such families that live under Christ's Government; and that such families may be good nurseries both for church and commonwealth." ^a

To where Edwards represents some of the Independents as holding the doctrine of an intermediate state, he receives the rebuff, "This is a question I never heard amongst the Separatists, or any of those whom you call 'Independent men.'" And respecting wearing hats at the Lord's Supper, the reply is, "It may be as lawful for one man to sit covered, and another uncovered, as it may be lawful, for one man to receive it sitting, and another lying in bed: 'but if any man list to be contentious, the churches of God have no such custom.'" ^b Again; to where he expresses his dread, that on Toleration being granted, the Independents will increase "even to thirty-fold," his opponent retorts, "Truly I think you are afraid, as Pharaoh was, lest the Lord's people should grow mightier than you!" ^c—"You seem to imply, that they should 'ask leave of the magistrate, to gather and combine themselves into visible churches.' I answer, I do not read that any ever asked leave of the Magistrate for such a thing; nor to perform any of the parts of God's Worship or Discipline. And yet you confess that these 'Independent men' do petition to the Parliament for liberty. Now, I pray you, Mr. Edwards, would you have magistrates, and kings and princes, to have more power over their subjects than over their bodies, estates, and lives? Would you have them be lords over their consciences? I pray you, where must Christ reign then? Must He sit at the Magistrate's footstool, and take what power the Magistrate will give him,—I mean, spiritual power, of gathering and making churches,—and such laws as the Magistrate will give Him leave to have to rule over them by? Here you thrust Christ into a narrow corner; for you would fain force him to give his 'glory' to some other, and his 'praise' to some graven image of your own devising, which He hath said he will not do." ^d . . You say, 'the oath of supremacy was appointed by law for Ecclesiastical persons to take.' Methinks that was a good consideration, for 'Ecclesiastical persons' have been, in all ages, ready to tyrannize over kings and emperors!" ^e

"You say, 'you would rather pray against Toleration than prophesy of the woeful effects of it.' I answer, If you can make such a prayer

^a P. 26.^b 1 Cor. xi. 16.^c P. 28.^d Isai. xlii. 8.^e P. 29.

in a time acceptable, then sometimes such prayers will be accepted which are not grounded upon God's Word!"^a

The passage about to be quoted, is of immense importance, throwing as it does a blaze of light upon conduct and transactions which have seemed to be inscrutable and altogether irreconcilable with principle and profession. "You affirm that 'these Independent men, where they have power, as in New England, will not tolerate any churches or Government,^b but in their own way.' In using the word 'these,' you carry the matter so darkly, that I know not whom you mean, for you have named none. But you seem to say, they be men that 'have power' in New England.—I answer, Indeed it may happen to be so; that there may be some men there that take upon them authority to bind men's consciences, as you and all your fellows do here. But if it have been so, I think it was because they had, here in England, taken upon them an Oath of Conformity; as you have sometimes done; and, because the tyranny of the Prelates was so mighty against all good men, that they were fain to go away privately, and so had not time or opportunity publicly to disclaim this their Oath. And then, there might be fear, that upon complaint made for disorder committed there, in suffering the liberty of the Gospel there; which could not be admitted here; they might have been sent for back by their Ordinaries, and so have been committed to some stinking prison here in London, there to have been murdered, as divers of the Lord's people have been of these late years, as I am able to prove of my own knowledge. And if they have banished any out of their Patents that were neither disturbers of the peace of the land, nor the worship practised in the land, I am persuaded it was their weakness; and I hope they will never attempt to do the like. But I am still persuaded they did it upon the same ground, that having knowledge in themselves that their former Oath might be a snare unto them if they did not hold still some correspondency with the practice of England, even till God should open a way or means for them to seek free liberty for all by the approbation of Authority."^c

We feel that we are putting a considerable degree of restraint upon our inclinations to produce a large quantity of useful argumentative matter from the Tract before us; but a necessity is upon us stronger than our will, and acting according to it we pass to the place where Edwards is thus addressed; "You have spoken much for Dependency; but upon whom you depend I cannot tell. . . If you say that you have dependency upon the Church of Rome, I do believe you; for the Bishop of Canterbury hath said so much in his book, where he confesseth Rome to be as leprous Naaman, and England to be the same Naaman cleansed!"^d

"But further, you add, 'That they,' the French and Dutch Churches permitted in London, . . 'maintain all their own poor.' Methinks, Mr. Edwards, there should be much more reason that the English Protestants, or Separates, should be tolerated for the same cause; for they 'maintain all their own Poor' also. And furthermore, they main-

^a P. 34.

^b Edwards's words are, "will not give a toleration for any other Ecclesiastical Government or Churches."

^c P. 34.

^d Luke iv. 27. P. 39.

tain the Poor of the Church of England! . . . They also pay their money for the maintenance of the 'Visited Houses' in the parishes where they dwell. Nay, furthermore, they pay also their money for the maintenance of the Priests of England, the more is the pity! And so I fear the French and Dutch do also. . . . And this is well known to all landlords that do let their houses; for if they know them to be Separates, and that they will not have to do with the Priests in the payment of that they call 'dues,' they make their tenant pay the more rent, for if the tenant will not, the landlord must. And by this you see their burdens are double to other men's." ^a

"I confess that Toleration would be neither riches nor strength to the Priests, for it is sore against the people's will that they pay them any thing now; and it will be no wonder when it shall be made to appear what the Priests' wages is." ^b

"Your words imply that so long as a man is not put upon the practice of that which is unlawful, he may bear! I tell you again, that your whole manner [of worship] is 'unlawful;' and therefore all the Lord's people as they desire to be blessed, and to be found walking in God's ways, have cause to separate from your Church, and to practise God's ordinances among themselves, as well as they who are separated already; which you here call 'Brownists.'" ^c

"You say, you would have them 'bear with the defects in your Church, and wait till God give you more light.' I answer, I know none that interrupteth you, for we will neither meddle with your 'idols,' nor with your 'gods,' if you would but suffer us to worship our God after the way that you call 'heresy.'" ^d

"No man can live in this land and enjoy his lands and liberty, but he shall be forced to worship according to the custom of the nation. Nay, children that be but sixteen years of age, though ignorant, and scandalous in their lives, are forced to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, though it be to their utter condemnation." ^e

"You might have spared your care taken to show 'a way for maintenance' for those among us that 'are scholars bred;' for if you can find no better 'maintenance' for them, than to come and be Lecturers amongst you, as you would have them, ^f and to live in hope of the 'gifts of the dead;' that is no good provision. For, for want of those shoes men may go long barefooted, seeing they cannot, by your own confession, do that of conscience till there be a Reformation. But you might rather have persuaded your Parish Priests to have bequeathed some of their large revenues unto them; for whether they have Parsonage or Vicarage, their 'Pole-money' comes in so thick to them and their followers, that it would make any sober minded man or woman to wonder how they can consume it. For, besides their ordinary tithes or maintenance, which is the principal, they have many other 'petty dues' which they require of every one of the king's subjects; and they are not so reasonable as his Majesty, which is contented with 'Pole-money' from his subjects from sixteen years old and upward; but they

^a P. 43.^d Acts xxiv. 14. P. 52.^b P. 46.^e P. 54.^c P. 51.^f Edwards, p. 44.

will have a share out of him that is born without life ! For if a dead child be born into the world, they will be paid for reading a dirge over it before it shall be laid in the earth ; and they will be apt to infer that ' their dear brother ' is departed in the faith though it be the child of thieves and murderers and the like. Further, they will yet have another patrimony for the birth of that child ; for before the mother dare go abroad, she must have their ' blessing,' that the ' sun shall not smite her by day, nor the moon by night ;' for which blessing of theirs, they must have an ' offering.' " ^a

" And these men be not content to take money where there is money, as the king is, but they will have these, which they call ' dues ' of him that liveth of the very alms of the parish ; whereas the king taketh not a penny of any that receive alms ! Then, if we consider their exaction, how they oppress the people by their cruel forcing of them to pay so much as they demand ; though it be contrary to all law or equity ; it will cause us to wonder at the hardness of their hearts, for rather than they will abate anything of what they demand, they will force poor people even to pawn their clothes. For I am able to prove that they do demand of poor people before they can have a child that is but fourteen or fifteen years of age buried in one of the out-churchyards of the great parishes ; which land is the free gift of the dead, for the help of the Poor, even as Cripplegate new Churchyard, or Aldgate's ; Rosemary Lane, or Whitechapel, Mile-end Green, or others the like ; before, I say, they can have such a child buried there, it will cost the poorest parent seven or eight shillings ! . . . Nay, when any poor man bringeth out of the remote places of the city, any corpse to Bedlam, which is the cheapest place that I know, yet when all things else are discharged, even as bearers' wages, grave-digger's wages, and the ground paid for also, yet they must be constrained to have a twelve-penny Priest to say something over the grave, and he will grudge if he have not more than a shilling, though he say but a few words without the book, when, perhaps, all the people that be left alive in the family be not worth a shilling." ^b

" Furthermore, if any poor man have a necessity to work upon one of their Saints'-days, then Mr *Paritor* must come and have a groat for citing him to the Court ; but if he appear not, he must be ' presented,' and for not paying fees he shall be excommunicated, and he shall never be ' blessed ' in again ; but though he be the poorest man in the kingdom, the price of this ' blessing ' will be a *noble* at the least. But if he happen to die an excommunicate ; then his friends must give money to absolve him after he is dead, or else he shall not be buried in the ' consecrated ' earth : but if his friends will go to the Office and give but a matter of five pounds for his ' absolution ' after he is dead, then he shall be buried in the ' consecrated ground,' and they will also affirm he died in the ' faith of Christ ;' yea, though he were excommunicated for notorious sin, and lived and died obstinately in it." ^c

" It is a plain case, therefore, that these men are a greater plague to this land than the natural locusts of Egypt, for they ate up the green

^a P. 56, 57.

^b P. 57.

^c P. 58.

things,^a but these eat up both green and dry. Nay, further, I conceive they are more prejudicial to the Commonwealth than the frogs that came up upon the land of Egypt, for they entered into the 'oven,' and into the 'kneading-trough;' and we read not that they ascended higher than the king's 'bed,' and into the beds of his 'servants;'^b but these are exalted above the chimney-tops to catch a 'smoke-penny' from every poor man's house!"

"Thus you see the mighty revenues of the Priests. If I had but time to tell you of the things which I know, even of the extent of their revenues; which is gained unto the generality of Priests by granting of licences to midwives, and to schoolmasters; with divers of their own officers, such as Paritors, Sumners,^c and Pursuivants, with a number of that rank which have strange names that I know not; it would, as I said before, make all men wonder how it is devoured. For they must be freed from all taxations, and have their houses rent-free, and many times eat their bread at other men's tables, and yet, for the most part, they die poor men and far in debt, and leave behind them both wives and children destitute of calling and maintenance; which is a plain case to me, that the hand of God is upon this generation in cursing that which they would have blessed. And therefore I will confess that I was overseen, in the entrance into this discourse, when I moved you to persuade these men to bequeath something to their brethren that are 'scholars bred.' . . I hope all the Lord's people will confess that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and that it is their duty to make them partakers of their 'carnal things' of whom they receive 'spiritual things.'"^d

"You say, that 'without a Toleration,' we may enjoy in a secret way our church-fellowship! Indeed, Mr. Edwards, we have learned that lesson already, for Christ hath taught us that we shall 'fly into the wilderness,' and that 'the earth' shall help us;^e but sometimes it proves to the danger of our lives, and always to the danger of our liberty; as it may appear by the practice here in London, for though we meet never so privately and peaceably, yet such cattle as yourself are always 'bleating'^f in the ears of the Parish Officers and Constables, with your other officers, even till you move the Lord Mayor himself to be your drudge, and as your horn which ye push forward for the destruction of our bodies, when he hath laid violent hands on them; for it is evident that it hath been to the loss of some of their lives. And this is the liberty we have in this kingdom; and all through the instigation of you Priests!"^g

"You plead for yourself, and for 'hundreds' of your 'brethren,' that you 'have borne the brunt of the times,' and yet you do profess that you will submit to what is established by law, because you hope it 'will be blessed and glorious.'^h I tell you, you are even like Issachar's ass, and so are the rest of your fellows, even willing to 'stoop down between

^a Exod. x. 15.^b Exod. viii. 3.

^c "Forasmuch as we are desirous to redress such abuses and grievances as are said to grow by Sumners or Apparitors: We think it meet that the multitude of Apparitors be, as much as possible, abridged or restrained: . . Moreover they shall not take upon them the Office of Promoters or Informers for the Court." . . Canon CXXXVIII. 1603.

^d Rom. xv. 27. P. 58, 59.^e Rev. xii. 14, 16.^f 1 Sam. xv. 14.^g P. 59.^h Edwards, p. 47.

two burdens,'^a because ease is good. For the law indeed makes any thing seem 'glorious;' but for any 'brunt' that you have borne in these last times, I think it hath not overloaded you, for I have not heard that you have been at two-pence cost to maintain the Lord's people in prison; and therefore you are very unlike to Obadiah,^b for instead of hiding of the Lord's people, you cry out upon the Parliament to have them hunted. And this is a great 'brunt' indeed, if it be well considered, and it is no doubt it will cost you dear by that time you have paid the reckoning, except God give you repentance."^c

"But now, methinks, I hear you boast very much of yourself and others of your Church.^d . . . You cannot choose but 'out-preach them,' if you preach them out of the kingdom! And it is very like you may 'out-live them' also, if you can but banish them into some hard country, or else get them into some stinking prison, as you, and the rest of your father's house, have done very lately."^e

"You say, 'whilst they were in the Church of England, they preached often, and now seldomer.' I answer, It is very like they dare not tell such as you when they preach, that cry out to the Parliament to disturb their meetings. Further, you say, 'they go looser in their apparel and hair.' I answer, I know some, indeed, that have been constrained to change their 'apparel' for fear of persecution; and, it may be, the 'hair' you were offended at might be some periwig, which some of them have been constrained through fear to put on, to blind the eyes of the Bishops' blood-hounds when they have come to take them. . . . It is no marvel though their 'spirits' grow 'narrow' towards such an adversary as yourself; and great cause they have to be 'strange' towards you, and 'reserved,' and 'subtile' also. But whereas you say, 'their churches be narrow:' I say, they are even like the way to heaven, or the gate that leadeth unto life, which is so 'narrow' that such as you can hardly enter in thereat! . . .^f And because Christ's flock is a 'little' flock, therefore you imagine they are not honoured of God; which is very carnal reasoning."^g

"I pray you, how can you count the parish of St. Helen's your 'spiritual children?' seeing you are there but a 'hireling;' . . . and you will only preach to them so long as any will pay your wages, but no longer! . . . How have you begotten them to God? You found them under a false power; submitting to a false worship; and you justify them as men begotten to God; and you justify their standing there. Thus do you 'sew pillows'^h of flatteries under their elbows!"ⁱ

"You hope the Brethren will withdraw their Petitions, 'that they may not be read in the House of Commons.' . . . That they should withdraw their Petitions is but one of your vain hopes; for they had more need now to petition than ever they had, both to God and men, seeing such a Goliath as you musters up so many forces against them!"^k

"And now, Mr. Edwards, for conclusion of the whole, I do here affirm that if, upon the sight of this Book, you shall conceive that I have either misconstrued your words, or accused you without

^a Gen. xlix. 14.

^d See back, p. 106.

^h Ezek. xiii. 18.

^b 1 Kings xviii. 4.

^e P. 63.

ⁱ P. 67.

^c P. 62.

^g P. 65.

^f P. 64.

^k P. 77.

ground, . . . then choose you six men, or more if you please, and I will choose as many; and if you will, we will agree upon a moderator, and try it out in a fair discourse; and, peradventure, save you a labour of publishing your large Tractates which you say you intend to put out in print against the whole way of Separation; and if it can be made appear, that in any of these particulars, I have missed it, I will willingly submit. But if you overcome me, your conquest will not be great, for I am a poor woman, and unmeet to deal with you! But if you do give another onset, before you accept of a parley, seeing I have offered you conditions of peace, the world will judge you an unreasonable man, and you shall never have the day.”^a

CHAP. XLI.

THE LORDS BROOKE AND SAY.

HAVING given some insight into the kind of spirits which set themselves in polemical array against whomsoever sought to worship their Maker as truly as possible, without the defilement of secular encumbrances, and the alloy of human ingredients; at this place will be introduced a voluntary advocate of the insulted and the oppressed; one whose talents, rank, and courageous regard for the cause of truth and justice, in which he fell, procured his distinguished virtues to be embalmed in imperishable praise. Our medium of revealing his name, compared with whose, the tribes of “Heylyns” and “Edwardses” are nearly smothered in their own meanness, shall be by a no less humble pen than Milton’s. Mark what he has written; to whom, and of whom!

“What would be best advised then, if it be found so hurtful and so unequal to suppress opinions for the newness or the unsuitableness to a customary acceptance, will not be my task to say; I shall only repeat what I have learned from one of your own honourable number, a right noble and pious Lord, who, had he not sacrificed his life and fortunes to the Church and Commonwealth, we had not now missed and bewailed a worthy and undoubted patron of this argument. Ye know him, I am sure; yet I for honour’s sake, and may it be eternal to him, shall name him, the Lord BROOKE! He, writing of ‘Episcopacy,’ and, by the way, treating of sects and schisms, left ye his vote, or rather now the last words of his dying charge, which I know will ever be of dear and honoured regard with ye; so full of meekness and breathing charity, that next to His last Testament, who bequeathed love and peace to his disciples, I cannot call to mind where I have read or heard words more mild and peaceful. He there exhorts us to hear with patience and humility those, however they be miscalled, that desire to live purely, in such a use of God’s ordinances, as the best guidance of their conscience gives them, and to tolerate them, though in some dis-

^a Isai. xli. 21. viii. 10. P. 80, 81.

conformity to ourselves. The book itself will tell us more at large, being published to the world, and dedicated to the Parliament by him, who, both for his life and for his death, deserves that what advice he left be not laid by without perusal." ^a

"A Discourse opening the Nature of that Episcopacy which is Exercised in England. Wherein, with all Humility, are represented some Considerations tending to the much desired Peace, and long expected Reformation, of This our Mother Church. By the Right Honourable Robert, Lord Brooke. 1641." 4to. pp. 124. Edit. 2. 1642. pp. 118.

This work, his Lordship tells the Parliament, to whom he dedicated it, was the produce of his "retirements in the last Recess." It is divided into one section of ten, and another of seven chapters. The first chapter of all opens ominously for the ruling ecclesiastics. "I aim not at words, but things; not loving to fight with shadows. It is not the look, much less the name of a Bishop, that I fear or quarrel with; it is his nature, his office that displeaseth me. Nor yet his nature, or office in general; but *such*, and so clothed, or rather veiled, with such and such adjuncts. For, to me, the word 'Bishops' signifies either (1) one that is to preach, administer the sacraments, exhort, reprove, convince, excommunicate, etc.; not only in some one distinct congregation—his own Parish—but in many several congregations crowded up together in one strange—and, for long, unknown word, a 'Diocese!' Or (2) one who hath to all this, added not only the name of a Civil Lord,—with which bare name or shadow, I fight not,—but also a vast, unwieldy—I had almost said, unlimited—Power in Civil Government; which must needs draw on a mighty train, and clothe itself with glorious robes of long extended and magnific styles, scarce to be marshalled by a better herald than Elihu, who could give no 'Titles.' ^b Or (3) in the last place,—which should be first,—a true faithful 'Overseer,' that over one single Congregation hath a joint care with the Elders, Deacons, and rest of the Assembly, who are all fellow-helpers, yea servants, each to other's faith.

"This last, is a 'Bishop' of the first Institution; of Christ's allowance; settled in divers churches, even in the Apostles' times. The first, is of the Second Century, when doctrine, discipline, all religion, began to wane: for even then, Mysterious Antichrist was not only conceived, but began to quicken. The second, rose last,—though first intended by the Church's Enemy: rising up while the World was busy looking all one way, as amazed at the new Beast, successor to the Dragon. This is now our Adversary! One, monstrously compounded of different, yea opposite offices; and those the greatest, both ecclesiastical and civil: for which he seems no way able, no way fit; and that for many reasons which may be brought from Scripture, Church-antiquity, State-policy. I shall begin with the last,—as that I aim at most.

^a "Areopagitica: A Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing." 1644. Works. 1833. imp. 8vo. p. 117. Leighton had said, p. 72, in his Epitome, see back, Vol. I. p. 502, "That thrice honourable patron of Christ's Cause, the Lord Brooke, hath published a master-piece which hath muzzled all their mouths."

^b Job xxxii. 21, 22.

“Here let us view our Bishop awhile as a Private man,—before his Office. Next, as a Lord over Church and State,—in his Office. Then, with some necessary Consequents—to his Office, as now it is exercised in this kingdom. Thus shall we quickly judge how suitable to true Policy of State are either the Antecedents, Concomitants, or Consequents, of this too *officious*, two-headed Bishop!”..

“Let us begin,” says his Lordship, in his second chapter, “with Antecedents: in them the first; which we shall find very unsuitable to his after-acquired Office. For the most part, he is *ex fæce plebis*; *humi-serpens*; ‘of the lowest of the people;’ an old complaint! Now for such a low born man to be exalted high, so high! and that, not *gradatim*, but *per saltum* too, as oft it is—in one of few or no School Degrees; which yet indeed, at best are scarce Degrees to the Civil honour of a Peer;—must needs make as great a chasm in Politics, as such leaps use to do in Naturals. . .^a But,” says his Lordship, in the third chapter, “this defect in ‘birth’ may be repaired in *breeding*; else we shut the doors of hope. . . It is true, Art oftentimes helpeth Nature. Some men of small beginnings, by their virtues have deserved for a motto and impress, the poet’s words,

Et quæ non fecimus ipsi,
Vix ea nostra voco —————

But when was this seen in a Bishop? . . . When these gentlemen, I mean the most refined wits amongst them,—for others come not within our question,—design the Ministerial function, they either lay aside Divinity, and so God is displeased; or else they labour seriously in the more Spiritual paths, and then the Commonweal is, by them, deserted: for these two so different studies cannot go forward *pari passu*: a Minister cannot serve God and Mammon! I know other men think otherwise of these studies; but I conceive the case is clear: for, sure, the complaints of good men, canons and acts of councils forbidding Ministers to meddle in State-affairs, and the answers of our own breasts, prove this truth more than sufficiently. . . I confess, of later times Ministers, like watermen, have looked one way and rowed another; so that, perhaps, now you may find canons of another strain. . . To those who maintain such Prelatical Bishops, this absurdity will follow, That to one man the whole Power may be given, both *in Civilibus et Ecclesiasticis*: a thing which God thought Christ only fit for; and so ‘on His shoulder’ only, did he place the World’s ‘government.’”^b Here his Lordship meets objections from the Jewish Polity, and descends from it to the Spirituality of the work under the Gospel: “A painful Preacher still crieth out, ‘Who is sufficient,’ who is fit ‘for these

^a Neal, in Hist. Purit. vol. ii. ch. vii., writes, “He reflects in an ungenerous manner upon the low pedigree of the present bench; as if nothing except a noble descent could qualify men to sit among the Peers. Several of the Bishops vindicated their pedigree and families; as Bishop Williams, Moreton, Curle, Cooke, Owen, &c.” Which “&c.” amounts to one more, as named in Fuller’s Church History, *inf. ann.* 1641. No doubt but his Lordship intended to strike at Laud, and one or two others, through the sides of some of the rest. Heylyn, indeed, applies the ill-savoured “speech” to Laud, whom he represents to admit that “he had not the good fortune to be born a gentleman.” Life of Laud, p. 46, 47.

^b Isai. ix. 6.

things?"^a They will get but little," he shows, "from God's Injunctions among the Jews."

"His Election and Ordination," writes his Lordship, in the fourth chapter, "I shall pass here." The examination of this point, he refers to Scripture and antiquity; where it may be better examined than under "State-Policy," of which he was treating. "Yet, by the way," he says, "I cannot but propose it as worthy of State consideration, how likely the inferior Clergy is to yield true 'canonical obedience' to one—that, *nescio quo jure*, requires it by oath,—though he," the Bishop, "be oft forced on them against, and never with, their express will. . . except, perchance, the whole Clergy of a Diocese or Province may be fully represented by a Cloistered Chapter; among which, are usually the very dregs of lowest men: who yet indeed, have no elective votes; but after the solemn dirge of '*Veni Sancte Spiritus*, are as sure to find the Spirit in a 'Conge d'elire' as others, not long since, in the Tridentine Post-mantle [Portmanteau]. Certainly it is to be desired," adds his Lordship, "that Christians would show as much care and conscience in setting Heads over whole churches, as some heathen Emperors did in setting Governors over private towns: which yet they would not do till at least free liberty was given to the Citizens' complaint and rejection, if not election, of the party propounded. And this, Antoninus learned from the Jews and Christians' choice of their church-governors in those times: though now, latter ages are grown wiser!

"We are now come to view our Bishop *in* his Office; . . made up of two most inconsistent offices, the one of Church, the other of State. His deportment in both, we may guess by his maxims or rules by which he goes; which once seen, we shall quickly perceive how well he squares his Practice by his Principles; and, how consonant both be to true Church or State Policy. I shall instance but in one or two; for we may know *ex ungue Leonem*. The climax runs up thus: first, The Church hath Power in all Indifferents: secondly, The Church is Judge what is Indifferent: thirdly, The Bishops, and their Creatures, are this Church! If a Prince hath power to command the persons and estates of his subjects, in case of necessity, and the same prince be *sole* judge of necessity, it will be no wonder to me, if that people be *ever* necessitous. If the Church have power *in adiaphoris*, and the same church be judge *quid sit adiaphoron*; and, this church be the Bishops, I shall not wonder to see those things that are purely Indifferent, made absolutely Necessary; to the insupportable burden of all men's consciences. . . They do really set laws, in state matters, under the notion of 'indifferent;' so that all the subjects' liberty, or property in goods, they compass with their net of 'Indifferency;' which they make heavy with the plummets of greatest penalties. Yea, though they meddled not at all with such things as these, without their horizon; yet if they make those things to be 'indifferent' which are sinful,—as they do, I fear,—and to these, *enforce* obedience with pretence of Church Policy, they overthrow all Civil government. . . In finding out what is 'indifferent,' *recta ratio* must be judge. But who shall tell us what is *recta ratio*? I answer, *recta ratio*! . .

^a 2 Cor. ii. 16.

“ Their tenets seem, to me, very unreasonable ; they will do more than Adam did : he gave names to things according to their natures ; they will give natures, according to their own fancies. . . In that they make themselves ‘ the Church,’ excluding all others, . . they exclude all others from Salvation ; for they say, in an ordinary way, there is no Salvation out of ‘ the Church ;’ and they, in this, admit none into ‘ the Church’ but themselves ! . . Truly I know not by what authority these *Bishops* style themselves ‘ the representative Church ;’ for they must do it either *jure humano* or *Divino* : by the last, we do not yield : . . by the first, they cannot ; for where do the People, either implicitly or explicitly, elect them, and resign up their power to them ? Is it in the Convocation, that they obtain this privilege ? That, by the Laws of this Land, is not at all obligatory till confirmed by Parliament : secondly, the *People* choose not these Convocation-men, but the Clergy ; and so they cannot represent the *whole* Church : thirdly, the *Clergy* have no free election ; for the Bishops will appoint whom *they* must choose ; and this too *sub pœna anathematis*. . . Thus having, with their chains of ‘ Indifferency,’ wound up the People’s liberty, they deal no better with their *Prince* : only, Polyphemus like, they leave Ulysses for the last ! For when the People are devoured, Kings cannot escape : but because Kings are of more prying spirits, they steal in upon them with sugared baits ; such as that of theirs, ‘ No Bishop, no King !’ . .

“ But I will rather view their Practice, according to these Principles of ‘ Indifferency.’ In this I shall be very short, not meaning to upbraid them with many monstrous miscarriages of late ; the rather because I am confident that God, his Majesty and the Parliament, will not permit them longer to transgress in this height. . . It hath oft made my soul bleed to see the greatest sins daily committed without more than a *paper check*, that I may not say *countenanced*,—while thousands must sigh in private, with loss of ears, goods, estates, livings, liberty, all, only for refusal of those things that, at best, can be but ‘ Indifferent !’ . .

The fifth chapter treats, metaphysically, of “ What is Indifferent ?” Skilful and interesting as it is, we must pass to where his Lordship tells us, “ I know I have many opposites who stiffly maintain that *optimum non est semper faciendum* : amongst these is that good man lately deceased, to the Church’s great loss, Reverend Mr. Ball, in his ‘ Friendly Trial of Separation.’” Here a metaphysical strain is pursued, till the conclusion is arrived at, that “ Nothing is ‘ indifferent’ *in re* ; *in se* ; but to our *understanding* some things *seem* so, for want of good light.”

The sixth chapter begins with remarks, that his Lordship had found “ the Nature of ‘ Indifference’ more abstruse than it seemed at first view ;” and that he was “ come now shortly to examine ‘ What Power may determine in ‘ Indifference ;’ and, Where this Power is fixed.” He shows that “ by ‘ Divine right,’ this Power is, and is not, in the Church.” This Power, “ wherever it be, must be warily exercised, since of all two extremes, only one can be lawful : so that one is wholesome, but the other poison.” The Church “ hath a Power judicative,—or, if you will, juridical,—but not Legislative. It may and must

determine,—for aught I know, beyond all external appeal;—yet again, it must not determine what, and how, it will—because it will! No: it also hath its bounds; a rule to go by, a constant law,—and that *non factam, sed natam*,—Right Reason! . . . If the Church should err from this Rule,—which God forbid!—we must obey indeed, but *patiendo*; I will, I must give *passive* obedience to lawful authority, even there where I dare not, I cannot, I may not give obedience *active*. By the Church, here I mean not only one, or two, or a few, of what Rank soever; but all, even every true Member of the whole Church; for, I conceive, every such Member hath *de jure* a vote in this determination.

“But, what if, after the determination, I yet dissent from the judgment of the greater part of the Church, which, in all doubtful cases, seems justly to challenge,—even by the law of nature,—a decisive power; what shall I do in this case? . . . I must read, pray, discourse, and confer, with all humility submitting myself to the Reason of every man that will teach me; much more, to the Judgments of many together, eminent for learning and piety. And yet if, after all this, I cannot be satisfied in my doubts, . . . I must suspend, till my judgment be cleared; lest that which to another is lawful, become sin to me who cannot act in Faith, while I act against or with doubts, or scruples. . . . In this case, I conceive no Power on earth,—ought to force my practice more than my judgment: for I conceive the Church’s utmost compulsive Power,—which must also very warily and but rarely be used,—is but Expulsion, or Excommunication; which yet, I suppose, may scarce ever be exercised on one that so doubteth: much less, fine, imprisonment; loss of member, or life; except his dissent, in Practice, hath necessarily with it a destructive influence into the State also and Body-Politic. Which case, I think hardly ever possible in those things which can be objects of *rational* doubts; which are only such as the Scripture hath not determined. . . . Now, I need not rip up the foulness of our Bishops’ mis-carriage in *their* Practice about ‘indifferent things.’ . . . In things seeming, generally, ‘indifferent,’ they have no Power peremptorily to determine to one extreme when there is a medium between both extremes, and so neither is necessary. . . . None but God can fully clear, much less force my judgment: but they scruple not, point blank, to *contradict* our Reason, and force our Consciences, in things extremely manifest; as in ‘bowings’ and many other things, which, one, as blind as he that so much commended Rhombus, may see to be unlawful!”

“Let us a little, view some of the ‘Consequents’ that result from our Bishop’s Office;” is the topic of his Lordship’s seventh chapter. “We shall consider but two; or rather one, with two heads—like himself,—at least looking two ways; his Relations, both upward and downward. First, Upward. *Nescio quo fato* our Bishops have still depended on another’s beck! In the time of Popery, they were wholly moulded to the Pope’s will. . . . Under the Reformation; if they have indeed cast off the Pope,—which may be doubted in most, but is past doubt in some,—yet they have ever been at their command by whose favour they stand! . . . Naturalists observe there is not so much apperance of change in *many* degrees of *entity* acquired by a second motion, as in one degree at the

first step, from *ens* to *entity*. But Moralists find that one step of new Preferment, makes more impression upon low [base] spirits than their first creation out of Nothing! Both are well reconciled, in our Bishop's rising: for what can so sudden, unexpected, advancement—from *nothing* to such a height of *being*—seem, but a new creation? So that hence, such a *dependence* must result as is that relation which Nature fixeth in the creature to his Creator.

“Courtesies and hopes, are the most oily bribes; and bribes blind the eyes of the most wise. With what nature soever *obligations* meet, they have an irresistible force; if they descend so low as men of base spirits, they there get a species of profitable, and so become like lime-twigs to little birds; it was, doubtless, most feelingly spoken, by the Slave in Plautus, *Esculenta vincula sunt firmissima*! If they [obligations] meet with men of high-raised, generous, noble, thoughts, they yet work much more, though out of a more ingenuous principle;—while a true noble spirit cannot breathe under the least shadow of ingratitude; having first learned that old proverb, *Ingratum si dixeris*. How hardly then, a *Bishop's* Conscience, judgment, reason, or will, can be his own, under not only so many *obligations*,—for the greatest engagement past,—but *hopes* also for new favours to come,—either in higher advancement or, at least, in continuance of His smiles whose first frowns may quickly reduce them to their first principle of *Nothing*,—I leave it to wise men to judge.

“To whom also, I humbly propound,—as worthy mature consideration, how fit these Spiritual Lords may be to sit as Law-makers in that Highest Court by whose fundamental Orders,—as also by the law of nature,—none ought to vote but *free* men! And, how can they possibly be deemed ‘free’ that wholly depend on another's thought—for I need not say beck, smile, or frown—not only for their first creation but continual preservation in this state and power of giving vote in that Court? . . . Will any wise man living think them fit to give counsel in Princes' Courts; to make laws in Parliament, and sit Judges in the highest tribunals of Civil Justice; that, all their life time, before the ‘*Conge d'elire*’ diverted their thoughts, were wholly taken up in . . . School triflers; before they came to some Church Benefice where, ever since, they have spent all their time—that might be spared from *tilthing*—in Liturgies, or Canons; except some new scruple, with some of their neighbours, have called them to peruse some author ‘*de Decimis*?’

“If you view their Civil converse, they have practised little but to wrangle down a Sophister, or to delude a Proctor in the University; to say grace to a gentleman, or acquaint themselves with a *Reading* Pew in the country! In cases of Conscience, they have studied little but how with most *compendium* to digest the oath of direct and indirect, in point of Simony; and, to swallow the vow of thrice ‘*Nolo Episcopari*,’ when God and their own consciences well know many of them are not so solicitous of Heaven as for a Bishopric! And, are these men fit, not only to rule the whole Church; to ordain, censure, suspend, deprive, excommunicate, *ad placitum*; to govern our Consciences by articles, canons, oaths, and what else a Lawless Convocation may invent; but,

also, to direct and advise—I might say more!—in the Privy-juntos? To sit at the helm, to dictate laws, and *tantum non* to sway the Sceptre! which if they forbear to touch, it is but as Mercury once spared Jupiter's thunderbolts; which he durst not steal, lest they should roar too loud, or at least burn his fingers? . . .

“We have seen our Bishop's Relation, Upward; let us now view it looking down, to his own Family, creatures, and dependencies! . . . Now, to what unworthiness will not ambition and avarice carry them, when they look on themselves as Peers and grandees of the Kingdom, and again reflect on their wives and children as those which, after their decease, must soon be reduced from such a height—like falling stars—into their first principles? . . . But *venales animæ* will do anything to rise: yet I hope *our* Bishops do not; at least will not do so any more! If so, let them know, the wheel of Providence can run as fast backward as ever it did forward. In its descent they may, perhaps, sadly reflect on a serious dying speech of one of themselves, ‘Had I served my God as I have served my Prince, I should not have been so deserted now.’ Though I must confess, I doubt they have well served neither God nor the King!”

His Lordship examines, in the eighth chapter, “What our Bishop doth, or can do, *for* the State.” He begins rather oddly: “It hath been the practice of these men,” he says, “to buz into Princes' ears, that they strike at Monarchy that are displeased with *such* ‘Episcopacy:’ like one of the old Queen's jesters, that would box and pinch any that stood near him; and if they returned the like, he would stop before the Queen and cry, ‘Madam; here comes a traitor to strike at your Majesty!’ I know it is one of the first Canonical principles, ‘No Bishop, no King:’ on this axletree the whole body of Popery is wheeled about. . . . What is the sense of this maxim? What can it be other than this, That the *strength*, nay the *being* of a King depends *wholly* upon a Bishop? Prodigious State-blasphemy! Kings have been, when Bishops were not; and shall be yet much more glorious when *such* Bishops shall be no more. . . . It is much rather true, ‘If any *such* Bishop, no King!’ as I shall make good in my subsequent discourse. . . .

“What meaneth this maxim of ‘Episcopacy,’ That a Clergyman cannot fall under the execution of a Civil magistrate, except they first degrade him? . . . What is the sense of this, That for breach of their Church Injunctions, they may Excommunicate people, ministers, lords, *Kings* themselves; whom they please; but, shortly, this, To reduce all men—even Princes as well as others—to plenary obedience to themselves? . . . Their insolent words and actions vented lately against the Crown, are very suitable to these Principles.

“Some of themselves, in open Court of Judicature, have dared to affirm, ‘They were beholding to none but Christ for the place they held:’ others of them,—and their creatures,—have said, ‘They are under no law to man.’ Some have preached point-blank, That their standing did not at all depend on the Crown. Others have flatly denied the King to be Head and Governor in Ecclesiastical Causes, over *all* persons. Though they cannot but know that this title was given mainly

to exclude any other earthly Head, as it is interpreted by Order of Parliament. . . .

“ I could briefly present you with a true emblem of ‘ Episcopacy,’ *ab ovo ad malum*, and yet not go higher than the Conqueror. . . . What if I prove Prelacy and Popery to be the same *in re*, and only to differ in name? . . . What our Bishops did in Queen Mary’s days—bloody times!—we all know: sure, it was an unhappy proverb that was then learned, ‘ The Bishop’s foot hath trodden here:’ what they intended under the old Queen; essayed in King James’s reign; and, had well nigh performed under our gracious King, Charles, to the ruin of the Crown; we now begin to know: if, at least, knowledge may properly be said to be wrought by sense; for, if so, our feeling was enough to teach us.” . . .

We have shown his Lordship’s sentiments of Episcopacy or Prelacy “ in Practice;” his next chapter, the ninth, is more especially applicable to their “ Doctrine.”

“ I am now come to the most moderate of Episcopal men: for even these affirm, That the absolute best Church-government, under a Monarchy, is ‘ monarchical!’ . . . Do they mean that all other Church-governments are destructive to Monarchy? Or do they mean Monarchy is destructive to all other Church-governments but ‘ monarchical?’ . . . I clearly conceive a heathen emperor may be as lawful a monarch as any Christian prince; and I doubt not but his subjects owe as exact obedience to him,—if his Civil title be just,—as we justly pay to our kings and governors. To say, then, that ‘ Monarchy’ cannot stand without ‘ monarchical’ discipline in the Church; is to weaken, if not to break the nerves and ligaments of supreme Power: nay, to say that such a government will ‘ best’ suit with ‘ Monarchy;’ is to veil the lustre and majesty of Monarchy, which, like a healthful stomach, can easily assimilate all things to itself, but is not changed by any. If they would but speak their own thoughts, they would turn the proposition thus, ‘ Church-Monarchy cannot stand without Civil!’ Here the mystery is unmasked. It is true, *this* Discipline cannot stand, but where *Princes* will uphold it: for that which hath no footing in Scripture must lean upon human right; and thus it discovereth its own weakness. . . . And, of this kind, is that human,—or rather demoniacal,—‘ Episcopacy’ of which we have treated all this time. Our Bishops foreseeing this,—for they are wise in their generation!—thought best to invert the proposition; and instead of this, That *Church-Monarchy* cannot stand without Civil; they affirm ‘ Civil Monarchy’ cannot stand without that of the Church! Thus they delude silly people.

“ But, to come a little nearer to their best meaning, who stand so much for *Church-Monarchy*, I would gladly be showed by reason, what there is in Church-government, why it may not derive itself into several Corporations where either more or fewer may bear the sway; still subscribing to those things which are left by Christ to the Civil Government, or Monarchical Power. We see hundreds of Corporations are thus managed; and what there is *in formali ratione* of Church-

^a Compare these positions with those in p. 66, 67, of this volume.

government—essential to Church-government—that will not endure this, *mihi non liquet*; truly I do not yet know; I cannot yet imagine. . . I do, from my heart, agree that Civil Governors are *custodes utriusquæ Tabulæ*: but what the Civil magistrate hath to do in church matters, till the Church hath done her utmost, I could yet never learn.

“The Government of Christ is Spiritual; and He will have his work wrought in a sweet way: by the power of the Spirit, not by force. If I err in this, I shall upon better reasons, recant; in the interim, hoping that the clearness of my thoughts shall, with the candid reader, receive gentle interpretation, I shall freely declare my opinion in this point. . . Will Rome admit us to expound to them this place ‘*Hoc est corpus meum?*’ Shall we admit Rome’s exposition? Will *either* of us admit Force? There is certainly but one Truth: but what shall be taken by the Church for Truth, the Church must judge! If you descend to Discipline, will not the case clearly be the same? . .

“So long as the Church, in her church-tenets, intermeddleth not with State-matters under the notion of Religion, I suppose the Civil Power is not to interpose: . . the Church must not go out of her bounds. . . Christ hath given us a platform of church-government, with the offices, and officers; who may here intermeddle but Christ himself? It is most true, when the Church findeth any refractory, and thereupon doth excommunicate him, he falls into the hands of the Civil magistrate; if he continue pertinacious, and not before. When Parliaments do consider matters of Religion, they do it to deliver the Church from *some* who would impose upon her; . . but if they once exceed their bounds, the issue will be Confusion instead of Reformation. . . Thus, under favour, both by reason and precedent, it is clear that *any* Church policy besides ‘Episcopacy’—though only one, by right, ought—may stand with Monarchy.”

In the concluding, or tenth chapter of his first Section, his Lordship begins by excepting “our Episcopacy” from his idea of a Church-government “well regulated;” and he protests that he believes “this kind of Episcopacy, is destructive not only to good Monarchy, but all other State Policy whatsoever!” His Lordship enters here upon a parallelism derived from 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, “to prove that our ‘Episcopacy’ is the same really with Popery, taken properly. . . If any man please,” says his Lordship, “to survey ‘Episcopacy’ with an impartial eye, he shall find this kind of Episcopacy and Popery to be all one *in re*; for they have the same rise, the same *media* of their progress, and the same end. The rise of Popery was, by overthrowing Christ’s Ordinances, and setting up of his [the Pope’s] own: . . he hath played his part mainly in Discipline; this, most properly belonging to Christ’s royal office, as Doctrine to his prophetic. . .

“By God’s rule the Officer’s Election is to be by the People; his Ordination, from the People, by the hand of the Presbytery; . . these, [Popery and Episcopacy] to cloud their swerving from Christ’s rule, raise up new terms, and instead of Election, have Presentation, Institution, and Induction. The first is done by the Patron; the second, by the Bishop: a way which Christ never knew. It is so well known

to all men, that 'Episcopacy' traces these very paths of Popes, that I shall not need to say more for this part of their identity. . . The coadjutors of the Ministers, by the Word, in some cases were the People; in some cases, the Elders and Deacons; and sometimes, People, Elders, and Deacons: but the Pope, in lieu of them, hath instituted another generation of Helpers, . . as Apparitor, Surrogate, Chancellor, Official, Commissaries, Deans, Church-wardens, *Overseers* of the Poor: in all which, 'Episcopacy' and Popery have so twin-like a frame, that seeing one you see both!" We cannot pursue this parallelism to its close; but hasten to where his Lordship closes this chapter and section together, with the words, "Yet but for a little while! For I am confident yet within few years, if not months, if not days, the God of peace and truth will deliver his Church of this heavy yoke: from which, with the Litany, give me leave to conclude, 'Good Lord, deliver us.'"

Arrived at the Second Section, we find it replete with points of general interest. Under the theme of "How consonant *such* 'Episcopacy' is either to sound antiquity or Scripture," his Lordship has seven chapters; treating, in the first, of "the mysterious covert of Antiquity," he wishes that "in matters which receive their being from Scripture so immediately as Church Discipline doth, we might make the Scripture, which is a sufficient rule, our sole guide, our sole moderator."

He speaks, without naming him, of "a most reverend man, famous for learning; especially for that learning which is not open to every eye;" who "hath taken upon him the defence of this cause. . ." If every word of that his book were true," he remarks, "yet it is little to the point: for the question is not, 'Whether there have been *Bishops* ever since Christ's time; but, Whether these have had power over their brethren; or, Whether one Bishop hath had jurisdiction over another, . . mixt with that Lordliness which now is used; forcing obedience by the edge of the sword, where the keys can give no entrance. And of this, in the whole book, there is not the least hint, *ne gry quidem!* Though this also were not enough for our question; which is not only of their lordly power *in Ecclesiasticis*, but also *in Civilibus*."

The second chapter, of this part, treats of "Our Bishops' Election, and Delegation;" the third, "Of Ordination;" the fourth, "Of the name and office of a Bishop in Scripture;" the fifth treats of "What form of Church-government seems most consonant to Scripture: Whether monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical?" Here, we meet with the well known text, Matt. xviii. 17. "In cases of Civil converse, we must make our addresses to 'the Church;' and he that will not 'hear the Church,' must be 'as a publican.'" In the context and the text, his Lordship remarks, "there are three things to be examined, before the true sense can be found out.

"First, Who is meant in that gradation in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verses: secondly, Who are meant by 'them,' ver. 17: thirdly, What is meant by 'publicans and sinners.'"

^a Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted. By Hall. 1640. 4to.

In that "gradation," says his Lordship, is meant first, the Party : second, the elders, or the bishops, the *officers* of the Church. "If you say, they are not there *understood*; yet I am confident you will not, I am sure you cannot, say they are there *excluded*! If, then, the Spirit pointed at *them*, with the other members of the Church, or *them*, solely, it would be an unnecessary thing to bring 'him' afterwards to 'them' again, as to the *representative* Church!

"Secondly: By 'thee,' ver. 17, is not meant *only* the Party, but every Christian; every church-member, to whomsoever the news of such a miscarriage shall come. Else, this will be a means to nourish particular party-sidings,—which the Scripture doth exceedingly shun,—if, by God's Law, he should be 'a publican' to one—of the Church,—and not to another. If he be so to every Member of the Church; this will be a hard case, That if a Bishop, or an Elder,—one, two, or more—shall pass the bitter sentence of excommunication, he must be so to me also, though I know nothing of it! But, some will say, that must be done before the Church. To which I answer, The Word saith no such matter. And thus, those who misexpound the Scripture must eke out the Scripture, to make good their own imagination. But, secondly, Why should it be complained of *before* the Church, if the deciding power be in the *officers*? *Frustra fit per plura, quod fieri potest per pauciora.* But, thirdly, and lastly; If you will have the *whole* Church 'hear;' it seemeth, to me, against all reason in the world, that the party *deputed* should have power, the party *deputing* being present! . . . All *officers* vail bonnet, when the party giving the power is present. Why are Parliaments the representative body of the Kingdom, . . . but because no place can contain the whole Body? But if all the people could meet *in Campo Martio*, should *those* who now are but Servants, then be *more* than Servants? Surely, the *whole* 'Church' being present; four or five, by God's Law, shall not rule all, seeing God's Law never appoints any standing laws against the rules of nature.

"In the third place, we must inquire after the sense of 'heathen' and 'publican:' *scil.* the most odious of men. Is it possible that any *Christian* shall be to any *Christian* the most odious of men, for the sentence of a Judge which he never heard, neither hath right to *hear*! Thus, if you will be bound either by text or context; or the common acceptation of the word, in the Scripture; by 'Church' must be understood the *whole Congregation*. Again; for excommunication of members, 1 Cor. v. 13, St. Paul commandeth 'them,'—*scil.* the whole Church,—to 'put away' that wicked person; and, ver. 5,—'to deliver up' such a one to Satan: 2 Cor. ii. 6—8, *they* restore him; *they* 'forgive' him!

"Thus we see everywhere, That in election of officers; in decision of controversies; in cases of conscience; in excommunication; the *whole* 'church' disposeth everything; not the Bishops, not the Presbyters, alone. . . . I conceive, then, I have clearly and briefly proved these three things, That there is little in Scripture for Episcopacy; much less for such an 'Episcopacy' as ours: something against them: another Government, clearly delineated."

In the sixth chapter, of this part, his Lordship treats "Of the con-

sequents that may probably follow the change of Church-government : of the great danger of schisms, sects, and heresies, etc. : and, What is, or who are, the cause of most schisms among us ?” We confine ourselves to his closing paragraph, where he says, the Bishops’ “mad outrage in all the three Kingdoms of late, hath so incensed the common people, that, in all men’s eyes, they are become most vile ; and while all men reflect on their constant trade of mischievous practices, the wisest begin to conclude ‘The very Calling hurts the men, as much as *these* disgrace the Calling.’ Thus we have by too, too long, great, and sad experience, found it true, That our Prelates have been so far from preventing Divisions, that *they* have been the parents and patrons of most errors, heresies, sects, and schisms, that now disturb this Church and State.”

In the last chapter of his Discourse, his Lordship resumes the general subject of the preceding chapter, where the dangers were applied to “the State ;” but he considers now, “such evils as may have bad influence into the Church. . . Every body, every Layman will turn Preacher ! Suppose all this,” says his Lordship, “be true,—which cannot be but supposed,—would it not be much better to hazard the coming in of all these than still to suffer our souls and bodies to be ground to powder by these tyrannical, anti-christian Prelates ; that under pretence of keeping out ‘Superstition,’ introduce downright Popery, and a sink of almost all errors and heresies ? . . We all know, that within these *ten* years, all the Nonconformists in England could not amount to more than one in two hundred ; and now, how many thousands there be,—yea, of such that rise one pin higher than *old* Nonconformity ;—themselves, perhaps, know much better than I. Yet our Bishops never were more active, than in all this time. Whence, then, ariseth the *new* Nonconformity, or ‘Separation,’ but out of our Bishops’ commotions ? I will not say, as the Fathers did of old, *Ex martyrum sanguine pullulat Ecclesia* ; yet, I must confess, I begin to think there may be, perhaps, somewhat more of God in these—which they call new schisms—than appears at first glimpse ! . .

“Before you pass any severe censure, be pleased to hear these poor men, you call ‘Separatists :’ know their tenets, and then judge. . . And I move this the rather because they are still ready to say, Most that condemn them never heard them. I could not but do what in me lies, to remove this scandal. . . I most affectionately entreat men not to condemn all things in those they now brand with their usual stain of ‘Separation ;’ which phrase many use in scorn, as if with one stab of that Italian dagger, they could run through body and soul at once ! . .

“If God please to communicate himself, in any manner of sweetness, so that a man begins to see how good communion and acquaintance with God is ; how easily it is interrupted, by loose walking ; how sweet it is while enjoyed, so that it ravisheth the soul, and filleth the whole heart, that it cannot but flow out at the lips, in sweet breathings of, for, and after God in Christ Jesus ; this man is presently stained with a taunt of ‘madness,’ and I know not what ‘enthusiasm !’ If one that had tasted, and experimentally found, the sweetness of peace of conscience, and knows how impossible it is to keep it, but by close walking with God ; how easily it is broken, and how hardly it is made up again, when

broken; so that he is content to leave friends, living, liberty, all, rather than to break his peace, wound his conscience, sin against God, in sinning against light, or acting against doubts; O! this man is beyond all rule of reason! He hath a tang of frenzy: one puffed up into a sort of self-conceit:—a rank ‘Separatist!’ . .

“When God shall so enlarge his hand, and unveil his face, that the poor Creature is brought into communion and acquaintance with his Creator; steered in all his ways, by His SPIRIT, and by it carried up above shame, fear, pleasure, comfort, losses, grave, and death itself; let us not censure such tempers, but bless God for them: so far as Christ is in us, we shall love, prize, honour, Christ, and the least particle of his image in others; for we never prove ourselves true members of Christ more than when we embrace his members with most enlarged, yet straitest, affections.

“To this end, God assisting me, my desire, prayer, endeavour, shall still be, as much as in me lies, to follow peace and holiness, and though there may haply be some little dissent between my dark judgment, weak conscience, and other good men, that are much more clear and strong; yet my prayer still shall be ‘To keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.’^a And as many as walk after this rule, ‘peace’ I hope shall still lie on them, and the whole Israel of God.”^b

When the questions of the origin and authority of the Prelates came to be investigated, and adjudged to be discordant from the Primitive *ἐπίσκοποι*, by men not only of competent abilities but of exalted rank, it cannot be surprising if the mists which had been cleared away, should leave exposed the rottenness of that attachment and veneration which

^a Eph. iv. 3.

^b Lord Brooke, says the Vicar of Shiplake,—Granger, Biog. Hist. Eng. 1769. 4to. vol. i. pt. ii. p. 376, 7,—“was one of those patriots who so ardently longed for liberty, that he was determined to seek it in America, if he could not find it at home. He and Lord Say, had actually agreed to transport themselves to New England; but the sudden turn of affairs prevented their voyage. . . It is observable, that the same man who was, by one party, looked upon as a monument of Divine vengeance; was, by the other, revered as a saint.” The admitted superstitious bent of Laud’s mind, and which might have been inspired with his earliest breath, displays itself in his Diary, under the year 1642-3, “March 2nd, Thursday, St. Cedd’s day. The Lord Brooke shot in the left eye, and killed in the place, at Lichfield, going to give the onset upon the Close of the Church; he having been fierce against Bishops and Cathedrals: his beaver up, and armed to the knees; so that a musket at that distance could have done him but little harm. Thus was his eye put out, who about two years since said, he hoped to live to see at St. Paul’s not one stone left upon another.” Diary, prefixed to “The Hist. of the Troubles and Trial” of Laud. 1695. fol. p. 65. And see Hume’s Hist. of Eng. chap. lvi. ann. 1643, note *e*. This St. Ceada, or Chad, Bede writes, Lib. iii. cap. 28, “zealously devoted himself to all the laborious functions of his charge, visiting his Diocese on foot, preaching the Gospel, and seeking out all the poorest and most abandoned persons to instruct and comfort, in the meanest cottages, and in fields.” It is true that he is represented to have been made Bishop “of that most extensive Diocese” of the Mercians, in 666. But such an itinerating bishop surely could not have had the saintly virtue of Lord Bishops, his successors! He is intitled to no mean consideration in the calendar of the Church of England’s saints before the Book of Common Prayer, if we may judge from the importance attached to his merits by another of her sons, ycleped “the witty Dr. South,” who in a Sermon preached in 1667, on Psalm lxxxvii. 2, says, “Nor is that instance in one of another religion to be passed over,—so near it is to the former passage of Nicanor, 1 Maccab. vii. 35,—of a commander

superstition had fastened upon ignorance. It would be an omission unpardonable if no account were found, in this connexion, concerning that noble compatriot of the noble Brooke, who, like him, dared to be honest in the worst of times. It will be sufficient for the purpose contemplated, to refer to "Two Speeches of the Right Honourable William, Lord Viscount Say and Seale, Master of his Majesty's Court of Wards and Liveries, and one of his Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council; spoken in Parliament. The first, upon the Bill against Bishops' Power in Civil Affairs and Courts of Judicature: The other, a Declaration of Himself touching the Liturgy. 1641." 4to. pp. 17.^a That it may be seen how greatly the retainers and advocates of the accused Prelates slander truth and traduce heroic virtue, this portion of the first speech is selected: "The question that will lie before your Lordships in passing of this Bill, is not whether Episcopacy,—I mean this Hierarchical Episcopacy which the world now holds forth to us,—shall be taken away, root and branch; but, Whether those exuberant and superfluous branches which draw away the sap from the tree, and divert it from the right and proper use, whereby it becomes unfruitful, shall be cut off, as they use to pluck up suckers from the root. The question will be no more but this, Whether Bishops shall be reduced to what they were in their first advancement over the Presbyters,—which, although it were but a human device for the remedy of schism,

in the Parliament's rebel army, who, coming to rifle and deface the cathedral at Lichfield, solemnly at the head of his troops begged of God to show some remarkable token of his approbation or dislike of the work they were going about. Immediately after which, looking out at a window, he was shot in the forehead by a deaf and dumb man. And this was on St. Chadd's-day, the name of which saint that church bore, being dedicated to God in memory of the same. Where we see, that as he asked of God a sign, so God gave him one; signing him in the forehead, and that with such a mark as he is like to be known to all posterity." Sermons: by Rt. South, D.D. Edit. 1823. 8vo. Vol. I. p. 185. Notwithstanding this, and Laud's solemn entry in his Diary, besides what Clarendon and Dugdale state, and differing in what they represent as his Lordship's prayer or address before advancing to the attack, it is especially to be noticed that Rushworth, in his Historical Collections, vol. v. p. 147, states that his Lordship was "killed, and Lichfield taken by the Parliament, on Wednesday, March 1st," which raises a suspicion that Laud had accommodated the time of the event further to gratify his personal resentment, by creating the marvellous, to beguile the credulous; beginning with himself. But what in one instance shows simply a weakness of the intellect in that particular, betrays in another its corruption; as when Laud and his faction represent Lord Brooke to be "fierce against Bishops," while it was notorious that his just indignation was raised only against "*such*" Bishops, and "so clothed, or rather veiled;" and that it was against "*our* Bishops' miscarriage in their practice" which this Noble Senator and Patriot denounced to the highest authorities in the realm, and to all posterity. So much for the "vengeance" ascribed to "one party;" now for the *reverence* ascribed to "the other:" this applies to Baxter, who, in the first edition, 1649, of his "Saints' Everlasting Rest," p. 82, 3. 4to. rejoiced that Brooke, Pym, and Hampden, were among those of whom he had "thought of Heaven with the more pleasure," because he should meet with them there. This passage Baxter omitted in all editions "since 1659," to appease the political rancour of the Bishop of London's Chaplain, Dr. Jane. "But I must tell the reader, that I did it not as changing my judgment of the persons... Which of these, the man knew to be in hell, I cannot conjecture: it is likely, those who differed from him in judgment; but, till he prove his revelation, I shall not believe him." Baxter's Life, Pt. iii. p. 176, 177.

^a There is another impression of these Speeches, in fourteen pages.

yet were they, in those times, least offensive,—or continue still, with the addition of such things as their own ambition, and the ignorance and superstition of succeeding times did add thereunto; and which are now continued for several politic ends, things heterogeneous and inconsistent with their calling and function as they are Ministers of the Gospel; and, therefore, such as ever have been, and ever will be, hurtful to themselves, and make them hurtful to others.”^a This statement exhibits, succinctly, a large acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, besides containing the essence of the prevailing grievances compacted in brief.

After having reduced Bishops to their origin in the New Testament, his Lordship continues, “ Their proper excellency is Spiritual; the denial of the world, with the pomp and preferments, and employments thereof. This they should teach and practise; but when they, contrary hereunto, seek after a worldly excellency like the great men of the world, and to rule and domineer as they do, contrary to our Saviour’s precept *Vos autem non sic*, ‘ but it shall not be so among you; ’^b instead of honour and esteem, they have brought upon themselves, in the hearts of the people, that contempt and odium which they now lie under: and that justly and necessarily, because the world seeth that they prefer a worldly excellency, and run after it, and contend for it, before their own! . . . I do appeal to all who have been versed in the ancient ecclesiastical stories, or modern histories, whether they have not been the common incendiaries of the Christian world: never ceasing from contention, one with another, about the precedency of their Sees, and Churches; excommunicating one another; drawing Princes to be parties with them, and thereby casting them into bloody wars. Their ambition, and intermeddling with secular affairs and State-business, have been the cause of shedding more Christian blood than any thing else in the Christian world.”^c The remainder of this Speech contains his Lordship’s argument to evince the expediency of the expulsion of the Bishops from the Upper House of Parliament; the authority upon which it could be then effected; and the example set in former ages.

The second Speech is aimed directly at the *Hierarch* himself who had cast some personal reflections upon the Respondent, at a time when his Grace’s star was, as Heylyn would say, in its *declination*; which was not, certainly, a time when any one would shrink before the breath of his mouth, as hundreds had when his Grace revelled in the licentiousness of power. This Speech commands attention not only for boldness, but for the description it contains of the Anti-Church of England party; and is hence pregnant with what concerns all who entertain the principles which the better minded among that party were anxious to propagate. Short as it is, it was so poignant as to draw forth an Answer of forty-four pages, folio, dated from the Tower, December the 3rd, from the practiser of “ violence and severity; ”^d but to which, this general reference can only be made here, with the exception of what will appear below. His Grace displays his usual polemical tact, and does not fail in mistifying his opponent’s argument by the free use of assumptions and ambiguities, and making a strange *mélange*, or medley, of

^a P. 1.^b Matt. xx. 26.^c P. 5, 6.^d Samuel Johnson, LL.D. See his *Life of Blake*, *ap. init.*

persons and sects ; or, if that were not done by design, betraying ignorance, and want of discrimination, for which he merited blame even as a statesman ; but in which defect his Grace is followed to our day by the crowd of those who affect to despise altogether, or deem it beneath them, to investigate into the minutiae of what is passing around them.

“ My Lords :—I have waited to find you free from greater businesses, that I might crave leave to speak of something that concerns myself. And this I have the more desired since my Lord of Canterbury’s last Speech ; who, expressing his troubles and bewailing the misery of his condition, and of the condition of the Church of England,—for he would needs join them together ; which I think he may, as the cause and effect, for the miseries of the Church have certainly risen from him,^a—he insisted much upon this, That these troubles had befallen him through the malice of two parties, the Papists and the Sectaries, and by those, he said, the Church was greatly afflicted ! How far this man will extend this word, Sectary ; and whom he will comprehend under it, I know not ; but I have some cause to fear that I may lie under some misapprehensions in respect of matters of this nature, which, how far it concerneth him, your Lordships will perceive by what I shall say.

“ My Lord of Canterbury, a man of mean birth, bred up in a college,—and that too frequently falls out to be in a faction,—whose narrow comprehension extended itself no further than to carry on a side in the college, or canvass for a proctor’s place in the University,^b being suddenly advanced to highest places of government in Church and State, had not his heart enlarged by the enlargement of his fortune ; but still

^a “ His Lordship says, too peremptorily, that ‘ the miseries of the Church ’ have ‘ certainly ’ risen from me. No, certainly : the ‘ miseries ’ of this Church have proceeded from the Separatists ; and from such as for private at least, if not for worse ends, have countenanced them and their strange proceedings against the government and governors of the Church. And this so long, till they brought ‘ the Church’s condition ’—which flourished before—to be the cause of my ‘ condition,’ such as it now is. And I fell into this ‘ condition,’ by labouring, by all good means, to uphold the Church of England from that ‘ misery ’ into which I fear it is now falling.”—The Life, Trial, and Remains of Abp. Laud. 1695. fol. Vol. i. p. 471.

^b “ This concerns me indeed, and very nearly ; for I see his Lordship resolves to rake me up from my birth : a way unusual for men well-bred, and little beseeeming a person of honour ; especially thus to insult a fallen fortune ! But yet it concerns me not in any relation to a Sectary, unless his Lordship would possess the world that I was bred in faction, and so like enough to prove one. But how my Lord is mistaken in this, will plainly appear. First, then, it is true I am a man of ordinary, but very honest birth ; and the memory of my parents savours very well to this day, in the town of Reading, where I was born. Nor was I so meanly born as, perhaps, my Lord would insinuate ; for my father had borne all the offices in the town, save the mayoralty.” *Ibid.* p. 473. Shakespear’s father had the advantage over Laud’s in dignity. He served all the offices, even that of “ chief magistrate ” in the corporation of Stratford. “ We must not compare these offices with such as we have seen in our days,” says the writer of a Life of Shakespear ; who says also, “ All these dignities, we have already seen, were perfectly consistent with the most deplorable poverty.” Dr. Lardner’s Lives of Eminent Literary and Scientific Men. 1837. 12mo. vol. ii. p. 78. “ There were two, above all the rest, who led the van of the King’s evil counsellors ; and these were Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, a fellow of mean extraction and arrogant pride, and the Earl of Strafford, who as much outstript all the rest in favour, as he did in abilities.” Mrs. Hutchinson, in her Memoirs of Col. Hutchinson, vol. i. p. 104.

the maintaining of his party, was that which filled all his thoughts ; which he prosecuted with so much violence and inconsiderateness that he had not an eye to see the consequences thereof to the Church and State, until he had brought both into those distractions, danger and dishonour, which we now find ourselves encompassed withal. Yet, to magnify his moderation,—presently after the breaking of the last Parliament,—he told a Lord, who sitteth now in my sight, That if he had been a violent man, he wanted no occasion to show it; for he observed that my Lord Say never came to Prayers : and added, That I was, in his knowledge, as great a Separatist as any was in England !

“ My Lords; how far he hath spit this venom of his against me, I am not certain ; but I may well fear where it might do me greatest prejudice. I shall, therefore, entreat your Lordships’ favours and patience, that I may give you, in these things which so nearly concern me, a true account of myself; which I shall do with ingenuity and clearness ; and so as that if I satisfy not all men, yet I hope I shall make it appear I am not such a one as this waspish man was willing to make the world believe.

“ In the first of these that he chargeth upon me, it may be he was willing to have it thought that I would not join in prayer with your Lordships, but refused such a communion ; which is altogether false, for I should most willingly join in Prayer with you : and further, I will add, that I do not think but some set Forms of Prayer, by some men, in some cases, may be lawfully used. But this is that which I am not satisfied in, That a certain number of men should usurp an authority unto themselves, to frame certain prayers and forms of Divine Service, and, when that is done, under the name of ‘the Church’ to *enjoin* them upon all persons, in all times, and upon all occasions to be used, and none other ; and upon this ground,—which makes it worse,—because these come from the *public* spirit of the Church—when the Bishop or his Chaplain shall frame them !—and others proceed from the ‘*private* spirit’ of this or that particular man.

“ This *injunction* is a usurpation of power over the Churches of Christ, and over the gifts and graces which Christ hath given unto particular men, which the Apostles never exercised, nor would assume ; and yet they might much better have done it, and the same reasons might then have been alleged for it that are now. This turns such Forms, instead of being directions, into superstition. This sets aside the gifts and graces which Christ hath given unto men ; and thrusts out the exercise of them, to substitute in their places, and introduce, a device of man. This injunction of such Forms upon all men turns that which, in the beginning, necessity brought in for the help of insufficiency, to be, now, the continuance and maintenance of insufficiency, and a bar to the exercise of able and sufficient gifts and graces ; as if because some men had need to make use of crutches, all men should be prohibited the use of their legs, and enjoined to take up such crutches as have been prepared for those who had no legs ! This, I confess, I am not satisfied in, yet I will further say thus much : Here are, with your Lordships, some Bishops, men of great parts ; able to offer up this worship unto God in the use of those gifts which God hath endowed them with, and

certainly they ought to serve Him, with the best of their abilities which they have received : let them make use of their own gifts ; nay, let them profess that they account not themselves bound to use Forms ; nor to this Form they use, more than any other ; but that it is free to them, to conceive Prayer, or to help themselves by the use of any other Form they please, as well as this prescribed : and let them practise the same indifferently, that so it may be manifest the fault rests in the person, and not in the service ; in the *negligence* of him that may offer better, if he will, not in the *injunction* of that which is offered ; and I will not refuse to come to Prayer ; for I take the sin then to be personal, and to reside in the person officiating only !

“ I know not whether I express myself clearly to be understood in this, or not, and it may seem to be a nice scrupulosity : give me leave, therefore, to endeavour to clear it by an instance or two. In the time of the Law, when God had appointed Himself to be worshipped by offerings and sacrifices, the shadows and types of those truths which were to come ; if a poor man that had not ability to bring a bullock, or a ram, or a lamb, had brought a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, it would have been, in him, an acceptable service : but if a man of ability, who had herds and flocks, should, out of negligence or covetousness, have spared the cost of a bullock, or a ram, and brought young pigeons ; his service would have been rejected, and himself punished. How much more would the service have been abomination, if men should have taken authority to have enjoined *all* to bring no other but turtles or young pigeons, because *some* were not able to do more ? In one case, there might be a tolerable and lawful use of that which otherwise used,—especially if generally enjoined,—would have been most unlawful. God will be worshipped with the fat and the best of the inwards ; the best of men’s gifts and abilities ; which he that worships, or officiates in the worshipping, is to do at his own peril. And if it be left free unto him, the worship may be lawful to him that joineth with him therein, in itself, though performed in a negligent, and so in a sinful manner by the Minister ; but if that manner be enjoined, the service itself is to be refused.

“ Now, in the time of the Gospel, God hath appointed ‘ the foolishness of Preaching,’—for so the world accounts it,—to be the means whereby He will save those that believe.^a I conceive, where there are no gifts enabling men to preach, there might be a lawful and profitable use of reading printed sermons and homilies ; and in such case, they might very lawfully be heard : but if *some men*, upon pretence to prevent extravagant preaching, should take upon them to set forth a book of public or common sermons fit for all times and occasions ;^b and should enjoin Ministers to conform to those, and use no other preaching at all but the reading of these common sermons or homilies so devised for public worship ; this would make it utterly unlawful, and to be professed against as that which were the bringing in of a human device and injunction, in the place and instead of God’s ordinance, to the exclusion thereof ; as the Pharisees, to establish traditions of their own,

^a 1 Cor. i. 21.

^b “ Articles of Religion ;” Art. xxxv.

made void the commandments of God. Let it be considered, what difference there can be found between these, but only this—use and custom have inured us to that of Prayer; not so in this of Preaching; and therefore the evil of it would easily appear unto us, if so enjoined.

“ My Lords; Let me presume upon your patience so far further as to give me leave to speak to the other imputation laid upon me, That I am a Separatist, and the greatest in England! And, first, I shall say of this word ‘Separatist,’ as that learned man, Mr. Hales, of Eton, saith, in a little Manuscript of his which I have seen, ‘That where it may be rightly fixed and deservedly charged, it is certainly a great offence; but in common use now, amongst us, it is no other than a theological scare-crow wherewith the potent and prevalent Party useth to fright and enforce those who are not of their opinions to subscribe to their dictates, without daring to question them, or bring them to any rule or examination either of Scripture or reason.’ And he observeth, that this was too usual even in ancient times, as well as now! Secondly, I say that there is a twofold Separation; one from the universal or catholic Church; which can no otherwise be made but by denying the Faith,—for faith and love are the requisites unto that communion:—the other, is a Separation from this or that Particular Church or Congregation; and that, not in respect of difference with them in matter of faith and love, but in dislike only of such corruptions in their external worship and Liturgies as they do admit of, and would enjoin upon others; this is a Separation not from their persons, as they are Christians, but from their corruptions in matter of worship, as they are therewith defiled. And this Separation every man that will keep himself pure from other men’s sins,^a and not sin against his own conscience, must make. And I will ingenuously confess, That there are many things in many Churches or Congregations in England, practised; and enjoined upon all, to be practised and suffered; which I cannot practise nor admit of,—except I should sin against the light of my conscience,—until I may, out of the Word of God, be convinced of the lawfulness of them, which hitherto I could never see sufficient ground for.

“ But, my Lords, this is so far from making me ‘the greatest *Separatist* in England,’ that it cannot argue me to be any at all! For, my Lords, the Bishops do know that those whom they usually apply this term unto, are the ‘Brownists’—as they call them, by another name,—and they know their tenets. The truth is, they differ with us in no fundamental point of doctrine or saving truth, as I know. Their failing is in this, They hold that there is no true Church ‘in England;’ no true Ministry; no true Worship; which depend the one upon the other: they say all is Antichristian! Here is their error; they distinguish not between the *bene esse* or purity of a ‘true Church,’ and the *esse*, or true being of it, though with many defects and gross corruptions; but conclude, that because such things are wanting which are indeed necessary to the *well being* of a true Church, and to be desired, therefore there is none at all in being! I hold no such opinion; but do believe to the contrary, That there are, ‘in England,’

^a 1 Tim. v. 22.

many true Churches ; and a true Ministry which I do hear ; and with which Churches I could join in communion, were those yokes of bondage which are laid upon them taken off, and those corruptions removed, which they do—contrary, as I think, to their duty—yield unto and admit of ! And this, I am sure, no ‘ Separatist’ in England holdeth, that deserveth that name. Therefore, I hope your Lordships will, in that respect, let me stand right in your opinions.

“ I shall now end, with two requests. The one, that your Lordships will please to pardon me for troubling you with so long a discourse concerning myself. I have not used it heretofore, and I am not like to offend again in the same kind : it is but once, and your Lordships will consider the occasion ! The second is, humbly to entreat of you, that where you know there is one and the same God worshipped, one and the same faith embraced, one and the same Spirit working love and causing an unblamable conversation, without any offence to the State, in your brethren that in all these concur with you ; you will not suffer them,—for Ceremonies, and things to you Indifferent, but not to them, but burdens which, without offence to the State, or prejudice to the Churches, you may take off if you will,—to be thrust out of the Land, and cut off from their native country : for if you thus shall wound the consciences of your brethren, you will certainly offend and sin against Christ !”

CHAP. XLII.

STRAFFORD.—VOTE OF JULY 16TH, 1641.—BAGSHAW.—WHITE.—THE BISHOPS’ FATAL PROTESTATION.—THE AFFAIR OF THE FIVE MEMBERS.—ACT TO EXCLUDE THE BISHOPS.—ORDINANCE CONTEMPLATING THE ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES.—REMONSTRANCE OF MAY 26TH, 1642.—BOOK OF SPORTS, ETC.—CHARLES’S ADDRESS TO THE HOSTS.—GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—CATALOGUE OF GRIEVANCES.—POSITION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

MAY 12th, 1641, the “two-handed engine” fell with its deadly weight upon the neck of the over-resolute Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford ;^a the precursor in their unhappy destiny of a never-to-be-forgotten Triumvirate ! The Earl had reached London, it is said, on the evening of the same day on which the Scots’ Deputation had arrived ;^b and it is remarked, that then “all the parties were on the field to finish one of the most perilous struggles in obtaining liberty for the people, or holding power for the crown, which history records.”^c “The loss of this gentleman’s life,”—thus writes Heylyn,—“after such a manner, so terrified the rest of his Majesty’s servants, that as some had deserted him in the first appearance of his troubles, so there were few that durst stand to him, or put him upon resolute or courageous counsels when he

^a See back, p. 68.

^b Nov. 14th. See back, p. 55.

^c “The Life and Times of Alexander Henderson. By John Aiton, D.D. 1836.” 8vo. chap. vii. p. 448.

most wanted such assistance." ^a This same authority relates a touching description of the Earl's last "farewell" of his chief accomplice in their country's ruin. Laud had been immured in the Tower since the first day of March preceding; and now he expressed his hope, "That when he came to his own execution, which he daily prayed for, the world should perceive he had been more sensible of the Lord Strafford's loss than of his own." ^b Another scene is, however, imagined to have passed between the ill-fated confederates, exhibiting the strain of popular sentiment regarding them. We content ourselves with the closing passages:

Straff.—Your head, no doubt, is grown the lighter
Since disinvested of the mitre!
It was too proud a weight, and known
To nurse bad thoughts: 'tis better gone!
The shepherds, on their sheephooks, laugh,
And do upbraid your crosier-staff:
No more your now deaf chaplains bark
What hour shall speak you 'Patriarch!' ^c

Cant.—Farewell, farewell; your time draws on,
Speak thoughts more sanctified, or none.
'Tis you must lead the way, and I
Shall follow after, bye and by.

Straff.—My life's short knarled thread, doth stand
Expecting fate's impartial hand;
Heaven hath my thoughts, my Lord: yet stay,
Shall we ne'er meet again?

Cant.—We may!
There's room enough in heaven; for two
Have more transgressed than I or you.
But I, what place and time, forbear
To name; 'tis God knows when, and where!" ^d

As one of the phases of the body-politic, and as exhibitivè of the temper of the Commons, it is needful that the attentive reader should be in possession of "The Order and Form for Church-Government by Bishops and the Clergy of this Kingdom: Voted in the House of Commons, on Friday, July 16,^e 1641. Whereunto is added, 'Mr. Grimston's and Mr. Selden's Arguments concerning Episcopacy.' 1641." 4to. pp. 8.

"Imprimis: Every Shire of England and Wales to be a several circuit or diocese for the ecclesiastic jurisdiction, excepting Yorkshire, which is to be divided into three.—ii. A constant Presbytery of twelve divines to be selected in every shire or diocese.—iii. A constant President to be established as a Bishop over this Presbytery.—iv. This Bishop in each diocese to ordain, suspend, deprive, degrade, excommunicate, by and with the consent and assistance of seven divines of his Presbytery then present, and not otherwise.—v. The times of Ordination throughout the Land to be four times every year; namely, the

^a Life of Laud, p. 482.

^b *Ibid.* p. 480.

^c See back, p. 49; the "English Pontifical."

^d "The Discontented Conference betwixt the two great Associates, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas, late Earl of Strafford. 1641." 4to. pp, [3.]

^e Page 1, is headed, "Sat. 17, July."

1st of May, the 1st of August, the 1st of November, and the 1st of February.—vi. Every Bishop constantly to reside within his diocese; in some prime or chief city or town within his diocese, as in particular.—vii. Every Bishop to have one special particular Congregation, to be chosen out of the most convenient for distance of place from his chief residence, and the richest in value that may be had; where he shall duly preach, unless he be lawfully hindered, and then shall take care that his Cure be well supplied by another.—viii. No Bishop shall remove or be translated from the bishopric which he shall first undertake.—ix. Upon every death or other avoidance of a Bishop, the King to grant a ‘Congé d’elire’ to the whole clergy of that diocese; and they to present three of the Presbyters aforesaid, and the King to choose and nominate whom he please of them.—x. The first Presbyters of every shire to be named by the Parliament; and afterwards, upon the death or other avoidance of any Presbyter, the remaining Presbyters to choose another out of the Parish Ministers of that shire, and this to be done within one month next after such death or avoidance.—xi. No Bishop or Clergyman to exercise or have any temporal office, or secular employment; but only for the present, to hold and keep the probate of Wills until the Parliament shall otherwise resolve.—xii. The Bishop once a year—at Midsummer—to summon a Diocesan Synod, there to hear and, by general vote, to determine all such matter of scandal in life and doctrine among the Clergymen as shall be presented unto them.—xiii. Every three years, a National Synod to be; which, for persons, shall consist of all the Bishops in the Land, and of two Presbyters to be chosen by the rest out of each presbytery, and of two Clerks, to be chosen out of every diocese by the Clergy thereof.—xiv. This National Synod to make and ordain Canons of the government of the Church, but they not to bind until they be confirmed by Parliament.—xv. Every Bishop to have, over and above the Benefice aforesaid, a certain constant rent allowed and allotted, proportionate to the diocese wherein he is to officiate; that is to say, every Presbyter to have a constant yearly profit above his Benefice.—xvi. As for the revenue of ‘the Bishops, Deans, and Chapters, &c.,’ a strict survey to be taken of all their rents and profits, and the same to be represented at the beginning of our next Convention; and in the meantime no lease to be renewed, nor timber to be felled.”^a

It is evidenced enough, that what the English Bishops had of Scrip-

^a “Mr. Grimston’s argument concerning Bishops: i. That Bishops [are] *Jure Divino*, is of question.—ii. That Archbishops are not *Jure Divino*, is out of question.—iii. That Ministers are *Jure Divino*, there is no question.—Now, if Bishops which are questioned, whether *Jure Divino*? and Archbishops, which out of question are not *Jure Divino*, suspend Ministers that are *Jure Divino*; I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker!—Mr. Selden’s answer: i. That Convocation is *Jure Divino*, is a question. ii. That Parliaments are not *Jure Divino*, is out of question. iii. That Religion is *Jure Divino*, there is no question.—Now, Mr. Speaker, that the Convocation which is questioned, whether *Jure Divino*? and Parliaments, which out of question are not *Jure Divino*, should meddle with Religion, which questionless is *Jure Divino*; I leave to you, Mr. Speaker!—Mr. Grimston’s reply: But Archbishops are no Bishops! Mr. Selden’s answer, That is no otherwise true than that Judges are not lawyers, and Aldermen not citizens!” *Both* these arguments are good.

tural Spirituality in their office, was sophisticated by the increments of their Temporalities. The "treasure" which the Apostles, one for all, spake of with characteristic humility, and which they confessed that they carried about in "earthen vessels," they laid no claim to, as of themselves;^a "having nothing," they yet possessed "all things."^b But whoever contemplates a Bishop revelling in worldly treasure and honour, cannot but strain his reasoning faculties to find out what similarity there may be between such a one and his alleged first progenitor! The ingredients essential to the composition of the later character, being other than what sufficed to constitute the earlier, must inevitably, therefore, produce effects incongruous from the original purposes. For as the concrete is made up of a superabundance of the "earthen," so the "earthen" must ever predominate. Hence springs the claim of jurisdiction set up by Bishops of this later order, even to the Supremacy in temporal affairs. Hence, too, the mutual repulsion which that claim necessarily occasions, and the perpetuity of strife between the "Spiritual" and the Secular Powers. History unfolds an abundance of cases attesting the truth of this conclusion; and it comes within the scope of our design to adduce, or rather revert to, an instance which amounted, in the Body whom it concerns, to an act of *felo de se*. Its own deeds produced its destruction; and the effort was paltry to attempt to fix the blame on "the Separatists," and "such as for private at least, if not for worse ends, have countenanced them;"^c while the same accuser would at the same time affect to condemn the fewness and meanness of these opponents, whom he charges now with being the producers of the Church's "miseries." A Church linked to the State by so many ties of custom, statutes, revenues, and immunities, to be shaken, but by such instruments, is incredible! Nothing, truly, so much as itself, produced its overthrow. See this proposition cleared in "Two Arguments in Parliament: The First, concerning the Canons; the Second, concerning the Premunire upon those Canons. By Edward Bagshawe, Esq. 1641." 4to. pp. 43.

Before the giving of any portions of these Arguments, it will be serviceable to present what Heylyn writes of their author. "Whilst the Archbishop laboured to support Episcopacy on the one side, *some* of the Puritan Party did as much endeavour to suppress it, by lopping off the branches first, and afterwards by laying the axe to the root of the tree. Bagshawe, a Lawyer of some standing, of the Middle Temple, did first prepare the way to the ruin of it, by questioning the Bishops' place and vote in Parliament, their temporal power, and the authority of the High Commission: for being chosen Reader by that House, for the Lent vacation, he first began his Readings on February 24th, [1639-40], selecting for the argument of his discoursings the Statute, 25th of Edward III. cap. vii. [*Pro Clero*]. In prosecuting whereof, he had distributed his conceptions into ten parts, and each part into ten several cases; by which account, he must have had one hundred blows at the Church in his ten days' Reading... The news whereof being brought to Lambeth;... the Archbishop thereupon informs his

^a 2 Cor. iv. 7.^b Chap. vi. 10.^c See back, p. 133, note a.

Majesty. . . To Lambeth goes the Reader, . . and was then told, 'That he was fallen upon a subject neither safe nor serviceable ; which should stick closer to him than he was aware of.' Bagshawe endeavoured something in his own defence. . . No better answer being given him, away goes Bagshawe out of town, accompanied with forty or fifty horse, —and it was a great honour to the House ^a that he had no more, —who seemed to be of the same faction and affections also." ^b

Let us see now, also, what Bagshawe himself relates, about nineteen years after, when his political position was somewhat altered. Alluding to Laud's behaviour towards him, he writes, " This sudden and uncouth act of his made a loud noise throughout the cities of London and Westminster. A great Peer of the realm merrily told him, at the next meeting, ' That he had often heard of a silenced Preacher, but never of a silenced Reader before ! ' And the vulgar people, at that time espousing a Scottish quarrel, increased in their clamours and hatred against him. This trouble he brought upon himself in meddling with things wherein he had no skill, and with persons over whom he had no jurisdiction : for Reading of Law in the Inns of Court and Chancery ; in both of which I have been Reader ; . . are for the benefit of the Students in those Societies. . . and such acceptation my reading found with the gentlemen of that Society, ^c which I shall, with thankfulness, ever acknowledge, that scarce any Reader before was ever attended out of town with such a number of gentlemen of the same House. . . The year following, without asking, or seeking, or stirring one foot out of my Chamber in the Middle Temple to that intent, I was, by the unanimous vote of the people, chosen Burgess of Southwark in the first place. Presently after my choosing, a Petition was brought to me by some of the chief of that Borough, containing in it the total extirpation of Episcopacy, root and branch ; as likewise of the Common Prayer ; and, that I would commend it to the Commons' House : I being the senior Burgess, and having the first choice. By this Petition I understood them, but they understood not me ; and, therefore, I dealt clearly with them, That if the present Episcopacy, which had so much exceeded the bounds of Law in the exercise of their Jurisdiction, to the grievance of the people, was reformed and regulated, according to the Law of the Land, it would be better accepted than in their utter abolition ; and this way, I thought the Parliament would go : And so convinced them with reasons for the same, that they seemed to me fully satisfied, and the Petition stopped. But they consulting, afterward, with Mr. John White, ^d my fellow Burgess, he approved of the Petition ; and hereupon it was delivered into the hands of Alderman Pennington, one of the Knights for London, who brought the Petition into the House with sixteen thousand hands ; which being read and debated in the House, Mr. John Pym—a gentleman with whom I had familiar acquaintance, and knew his mind in that point—spake to this purpose, ' That he thought it was not the intention of the House to abolish either Episcopacy or the Book of Common Prayer, but to reform both wherein offence was given to the people. And if that could be effected

^a The Middle Temple.^b P. 406, 407.^c The Middle Temple.^d Chairman of the Committee for Scandalous Ministers, in 1643.

and assented to by them, with the concurrence of the King and Lords, they should do a very acceptable work to the people; and such as had not been since the Reformation, which was then about eighty years.'.. For my own part, being then at that debate a member of the House, I openly declared my opinion concerning Bishops, for establishing them in their function and jurisdiction, agreeable to Law; according to what I had done and held in my Reading, without wavering or warping at all." ^a

It should seem, from these particulars, that the infection was become more general than to be restrained to the "Separatists" and their abettors only. The truth is, that the struggle was between the conflicting Jurisdictions; and it was fit that the Civil Courts should put an effectual stop to the usurpations of what Heylyn calls the "Court Christian." ^b That the vessel of the Church would founder, its helm being intrusted to so rashly adventurous a Pilot, is what was foreseen; but that it was foreseen his incapacity—for he was of "*doctissimorum hominum indoctissimum genus*," ^c—would involve in the vessel's fate the deplorable catastrophe which befel the King his Master, there is not the smallest historical evidence which we recognize: "between resisting a Prince and dethroning him," remarks Hume, "there is a wide interval." ^d And the ascendancy of the Republicans did not display itself till the close of the year 1644. ^e

Bagshawe's first Argument concerns "the legality of the Canons." ^f He says, "I hold three illegalities." And he generalizes, "that they are against Clergy and Laity; without their common consent: they were not well created by any of the King's writs or commissions, to enable them to make Canons; which were not made in a Convocation, or, in a new Synod derived out of an old Convocation, as was wittily observed by a noble Lord, but they were made in a mere convocation of the Clergy who had no warrant or authority to do as they did. The matters contained in the said Canons are against the fundamental laws and statutes of the Realm."

The first point which he undertook to prove, is, That the Clergy never could make Canons and Constitutions that should bind the Clergy and Laity, without their common consent; and to effect his purpose he cast "the whole Clergy into five stages of time." The first stage, was "from Christ's time till the days of Constantine;" the second, from Constantine's days "until the Conquest;" the third, was from the Conquest "till the days of King Edward I.;" the fourth, from Edward "to the twenty-fifth year of Henry VIII., in which time the Common Law

^a A Just Vindication of the Questioned Part of the Reading of Edward Bagshaw, Esq. 1660. 4to. p. 2—4.

^b P. 407.

^c Erasmus.

^d Hist. Eng. Chap. lix. an. 1649.

^e Hist. of the Commonwealth. By W. Godwin, 1824. Vol. i. chap. ii. p. 18. Hallam remarks that "The spirit of ecclesiastical rather than civil democracy was the first sign of the approaching storm." Constitutional Hist. of Eng. 1827. 4to. Vol. i. ch. ix. p. 581. And Sir James Mackintosh, or his Continuator, says, under 1642, "There were already, beyond doubt, aspirations after a Republic; but it does not appear that there was any resolved design." Lardner's Cont. Mackintosh's Hist. of Eng. 1835. 12mo. Vol. v. p. 309.

^f See back, p. 49.

began to recover and get strength ; and all that time the Clergy could make no laws, canons, or constitutions, but what the Common Law did allow :” the last stage, or tract of time, from “ 25 Hen. VIII., cap. xix., until this very time.”

Having produced his authorities, he adds “ Thus have I, as briefly as I could, run over the practice of all ages in making Ecclesiastical laws : and the reasons of their practice are chiefly these, . . . If property of *goods* cannot be taken from me without my assent in Parliament, which is the fundamental law of the Land, and so declared in the Petition of Right ; why then, property and liberty of *Conscience*, which is much greater, as much as *bona animi* are above *bona fortunæ*, cannot be taken from me without my assent. Liberty of Religion and Conscience are, as I take it, within the words of Magna Charta ; granted to me as my inheritance : ‘ Nullus liber homo imprisonetur aut disseisetur de libertatibus vel liberis consuetudinibus suis.’^a And liberty of Conscience is the greatest liberty ! It is, by a necessary consequence and deduction, within the word ‘ imprisonetur :’ for put the case, that the Clergy make Canons to which I never assented, and I break those Canons ; whereupon, I am excommunicated, and upon a Significavit by the Bishop, my body is taken and imprisoned by a writ De excommunicato capiendo, now shall I lie in prison all the days of my life ; and shall never be delivered by a Cautione admittenda, unless I will come in, ‘ et parere mandatis Ecclesiæ ;’ which are point blank against my conscience. And thus have I proved the first and chiefest point, That no Canons can bind the Laity and Clergy without consent in Parliament ; and, therefore, these Canons . . . cannot bind.”

His second point assumes, that though Canons could be made without common assent, yet had not the Clergy lawful authority to make “ these.” He has set down the dates of the calling, and the progress, of this Convocation, and argues that though the Canons had the form of Confirmation by the King’s Letters Patent, according to the form of the said statute of Henry, yet not being made “ in Convocation,” the “ foundation failing,” the Confirmation is “ absolutely void.”

In his third point, he has shown, that notwithstanding the Clergy had had power and lawful authority, still these Canons are void in law, “ for the matter contained in them.” In making determinations, in the First Canon, “ concerning Royal power, and property of goods ; they have done against law ; and have meddled with things of which they have no cognizance, for the exposition of them belongs to the Judges of the Law ; and they have no more right to expound them, than the Judges have to expound texts of Scripture !” Concerning the twelfth and thirteenth Canons, “ touching the freeing and discharging of Chancellors and Officials from executing any Excommunication, or any Censure, against the Clergy, because they are Laymen ;” seeing, says Bagshawe, “ an Act of Parliament hath given this power to Laymen, it is a high presumption in them to make Canons against it.” Concerning the Oath, in the sixth Canon, “ I hold,” he says, “ that no oath can be imposed upon the Subject, but what is warranted either by the custom of the realm, which is no other than the Common Law, or else by some Act

^a Cap. xxix.

of Parliament to warrant it." His authorities are laid down hereupon, and he then proceeds to say, "An oath is no Canon or Constitution, but a mere collateral thing; just as if they should have enjoined a man to have entered into a bond of a thousand pounds to have observed their Canons; this had been void, and a prohibition had lain at the Common Law for it; because this is a collateral thing, and a charge upon my goods; and so is an oath, upon my conscience. And therefore, in pressing an oath by virtue of their sixth Canon, they have exceeded their authority."

"Concerning the matter of the Oath, divers exceptions have been taken by those Learned Gentlemen that have argued before, which I will not remember, but add four which have not yet been spoken to. The first exception, is in these words, 'That I will not endeavour by myself or any other, to bring in any Popish Doctrine, contrary to that which is so established.' Now, 'that' and 'so,' being words of relation, do refer to the next antecedent, 'Popish Doctrine,' not mentioned in any part of the oath before. So that, *reddenda singula singulis*, it runs thus in sense and construction:—I will not endeavour myself to bring in any Popish Doctrine 'contrary' to that Popish Doctrine which is so established: *ergo*, some Popish Doctrine is 'established' by the Church of England. This construction was so evident to them that, for the curing thereof,—though this Oath, with the word 'Popish' in it, and the rest of the Canons, were confirmed by the King's Letters Patent, 30th of June, 16 Car., yet the 5th of July after, they got a Commission from the King, to give this Oath, leaving out the word 'Popish;' whereby they have made the remedy worse than the disease, by giving an Oath which was never confirmed by the King!

"The second exception, is in these words, 'Nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons, etc.,' which I may fitly call a covenant against the King's Supremacy; which I thus make good: It is a part of my Oath of Supremacy, that I shall assist the King in all pre-eminences and jurisdictions belonging to his Crown.^a Now, it is part of his jurisdiction to 'alter' this 'government' by his Parliament, and to appoint and establish another. Which, if he shall be so minded to do, I am by this Oath [of the Canon] not to assist him in it. I am not so much as to give my assent! Whereby I do unavoidably fall upon this rock, that for the saving of my oath, I must deny my obedience to the King; or, by obeying the King, I must fall upon perjury."

"The third exception, is in these words, I will not consent to alter the 'government' of this Church by Archbishops, &c., 'as it stands now established, and as by Right it ought to stand.' Now, to speak properly, there is no 'government' of this Church of England 'by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons, etc.:' but only by the King; and they govern only by and under him. And why the KING should be left out, seems a thing strange to me, unless they will say he is comprehended within the 'etc.,' which is a most unworthy place for so great a Majesty! And that the Clergy had some ill meaning in this omission of the King out of this Oath, I have some reason more than to suspect,

^a 1 Eliz. cap. i.

when I cast my eye upon some dangerous passages that are in their writings, about the King's Supremacy; advancing it higher than the King himself would have them, touching the Subject's property of goods, but depressing it too low concerning his Ecclesiastical power."

"The fourth, and last, exception to the Oath, is in these words, 'Nor shall you ever subject it'—the Church of England—to the usurpations and superstitions of the *See* of Rome;' and doth not say the *Church* of Rome: whereby it contains a negative pregnant; that is to say, you may *not* 'subject' the Church of England to the superstitions and usurpations 'of the *See* of Rome;' but you may 'subject' it to the usurpations and superstitions of the Church of Rome! . . . And that the Clergy had an ill meaning in leaving this clause in the Oath thus loose, I have some reason to imagine, when I find in their late books, that they say 'the Church of Rome is a true Church,' and 'Salvation is to be had in it.'"

"And so, Mr. Speaker, I have done with the Canons, and conclude that they are illegal, in point of original jurisdiction; in point of derivative authority; in the matter and form of them: or more briefly, in the language of the Schools, they are illegal and void *in toto et in qualibet parte*."

Such is the best abridged representation of Bagshawe's First Argument which its bearing on the interests of the then and of later "Separatists" demands at our hands. The more formal or technical portions of this argument, omitted here, are not less stringent in their conclusions.

The Second Argument, on which more conciseness must be employed, is opened thus,—“Mr. Speaker; I am by the order of the House, to speak, this day, of the Penalty which the Clergy, by making their late Canons in their late Convocation, rather than Synod, have forfeited and incurred. . . . Illegal faults draw after them legal punishments: for there are no venial sins, at the Common Law, . . . I was doubtful, at first, what punishment I should fix upon the Clergy; but considering the Vote of this House, That the late Canons were against the King's Prerogative Royal, the Fundamental Laws of the Land, the Liberty of the Subject, and divers Acts of Parliament; I settled my resolutions. . . .

"I hold they have incurred a Premunire; namely, all 'Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, ETC.,' which consented to the making of them. . . .

"A Premunire, is a defence of the Crown and Laws of the Land from the tyranny and oppression of Spiritual Jurisdiction; . . . whereby is incurred this Penalty, of being put out of the King's protection, loss of lands and goods, and perpetual imprisonment. This may seem a sharp and severe punishment to be inflicted on Clergymen; but when the reasons and grounds of Law are considered, and how Kings of England were necessitated to it, the sharpness of the punishment will not seem strange to any.

"Concerning the original cause and ground of the Premunire, it ariseth from the opposition and antipathy betwixt the Common and the Canon Law; or the Law of God, and the Law of the Pope: the Common Law being derived from the one, and the Canon Law from the

other; which makes the opposition as great as betwixt Christ and Anti-christ; which hath in all ages, as I could show you, caused a hatred of our Law and the Professors thereof, from the Clergy and Professors of the Canon Law. . . . And as the contention and opposition increased, so did the punishment; as may appear in these four particulars: The first punishment upon the Clergy was Prohibition only; the second, was a Prohibition with a Pain; the third, was by Fine and Imprisonment; the fourth, and last, when none of the rest would do good, was by a Premunire. And there it ended."

Bagshawe's exemplification of the mutual strife is comprised in his next fifteen or sixteen pages, and it exhibits much exceedingly curious matter. We select two only from among the "Objections" which he adduced. The Fourth is, that "'The Ecclesiastical Courts, say they, are now become the King's Courts, by the Statute 1 Eliz. cap. i., as other Courts in Westminster Hall; and therefore the King cannot have a Premunire against himself!' I deny this. For they are the King's Courts now no more than they were before: for the Statute, 1 Eliz., did not give the King any new power, but only restored the old which he had before. And this answer did Chancellor Audley give to Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who made this objection; telling him withal, That the Premunire was a rod that the Common Law had to keep the *Bishops* in awe, and to reduce them to good order, otherwise men would have no quiet for them!"

The Sixth and "greatest Objection" is this, "The Bishop of Exeter [Hall,] and divers Divines more hold that 'the Jurisdiction of Bishops is *jure Divino*; whereupon it follows, that neither Prohibition nor Premunire can restrain that Jurisdiction which derives from the Law of God.' This indeed is true, if their Jurisdiction were of that nature; but I have proved before by divers Acts of Parliament, that their Jurisdiction is acknowledged, by the Law of England, only to be *jure humano*: . . . the Common Law doth agree with these Statutes. . . . But what do I speak of the Common Law, for the very Church of England seems to be of this opinion, for in our Book of Common Prayer, no more is allowed to Bishops, in point of 'Divine right,' than what is common with pastors, ministers, and curates; for there are but three Prayers for Bishops in all the Book; . . . and they all run to the same purpose. The first is in the Litany, 'That it may please Thee to illuminate all Bishops,' etc.; wherein nothing is mentioned but their knowledge of God's Word, their good life and doctrine! The next Prayer for them is, . . . that 'God would send down upon all our Bishops and Curates, and all Congregations committed to their charge,' etc.; where the taking care of the cure of souls in Congregations committed to them, is the main thing which we pray for on their behalf. The last, is in the Prayer for the Militant Church, 'Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all Bishops, Pastors and Curates, that they may, both by their life and doctrine, set forth thy true and lively Word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy Sacraments;' where there is not so much as a word mentioned of their Jurisdiction!

"And so, Mr. Speaker, do I conclude my whole Argument touching the penalty incurred by the Clergy, for their illegal Canons made in

their Synod at Paul's; concerning which, I will end all in these two verses, which may be better applied to this Synod than the Arminians applied them to the Synod at Dort:

Paulinæ Synodus nodus Chorus, integer ager,
Conventus ventus, Sessio stramen, Amen."

Mr. White, co-burgess with Bagshawe, addressed the Commons, January the 17th, 1641-2, when he told the House, "The greatest and chiefest authors of our miseries are the Bishops and their adherents, favourers of the Romish and Arminian faction; that have, with a high hand and stretched-out arm, in their several places of power and jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal, exercised cruelty and tyranny over the children and saints of God; binding the consciences of free subjects only to their opinions and commands, in the exercise of their Religion. With extremity and greatest severity, inflicting punishment upon those of tender consciences that shall refuse the same: enjoining all the Clergy under their authority, to teach such things as may serve only to the defence and maintenance of their devised doctrines and tenets of their superiors, preaching the same out of fear, not conscience. These corrupt Bishops, Lords over their brethren and fellow-servants in the administration of the mysteries of Salvation, have been the prime authors of all the troubles we are now encumbered withal. I speak not, Mr. Speaker, altogether against their persons, but even their offices and places of authority as now they are used; contrary to the true intent of the Apostles, in the first admitting of the ordination of Bishops." ^a

As usual, when the Bishops—"innocent doves"—were at fault, otherwise to extricate themselves from error, they made no hesitation in loading the King with all the responsibility; accordingly, Hall ^b told the Lords, November the 12th, "They say we have made Canons and Constitutions. Alas, my Lords, we have made none! We neither did nor could make Canons, more than they can make laws... We might propound some such Constitutions as we should think might be useful; but when we have done, we send them to his Majesty; who, perusing them *cum avisamento Consilii sui*,^c and approving them, puts life into them, and of dead propositions makes them Canons. As, therefore, the laws are the King's laws, and not ours; so are the Canons the King's Canons, and not the Clergy's. Think thus of them; and then draw what conclusions you please." ^d

So judicially overtaken were the Prelates, and apparently so resolved to precipitate their ruin, that being bereft of all discretion, they committed error upon error, and furnished their enemies with an accumulation of reasons for proceeding publicly to impugn their Order. It belongs to other histories to display the particulars of those transactions, and to describe the tumults which they occasioned. It concerns our-

^a Nalson's "Collection, etc." 1683. fol. vol. ii. p. 886. "Thus," adds Nalson, "did these vultures and harpies accuse the *innocent doves*, upon whom they intended to prey and quarry." P. 887.

^b About this time, translated from Exeter to Norwich.

^c That is, *alter et idem*; we have seen sufficiently what was the influence of the Bishops in the Council.

^d Works, vol. x. p. 68.

selves, however, to relate that the Bishops had incurred such odium that they were constantly molested, and in danger of the worst effects of popular rage. In December they were so determinately, indignantly treated, that twelve of them adopted the unhappy resolution of drawing up and subscribing a "Protestation" which they presented to the King, who transmitted it to the House of Lords. It was debated, the next day, and a conference being resolved upon, the Lord Keeper, Littleton, in the name of the Lords informed the Commons that this Protestation contained "matters of high and dangerous consequence."^a Whereupon the Commons resolved, within half an hour, to impeach the twelve Bishops for conspiring to subvert the fundamental laws and being of Parliaments. "No man, in either House, ventured to speak a word in their vindication; so much displeased was every one at the egregious imprudence of which they had been guilty."^b Heylyn called it "the last flash of their dying light."^c

"Whereas," said these Bishops, "their fears" of affronts, indignities, and dangers, "are not built upon fancies and conceits, but upon such grounds and objects as may well terrify men of good resolutions and much constancy; they do, in all humility and duty, protest before your Majesty and the Peers of that Most Honourable House of Parliament, against all laws, orders, votes, resolutions, and determinations, as, in themselves, null and of none effect, which, in their absence since the 27th of this instant month of December, 1641, have already passed; as likewise, all such as shall hereafter pass in that Most Honourable House, during the time of this their forced and violent absence from the said Most Honourable House; not denying but if their absenting themselves were wilful and voluntary, that Most Honourable House might proceed in all these Premises, their absence in this their Protestation notwithstanding: and humbly beseeching your Most Excellent Majesty to command the Clerk of the House of Peers to enter this their Petition and Protestation among their records, They will ever pray, etc."^d

The twelve Bishops being put under arrest, and ten of them "being caged, sure enough, in the Tower, the Faction," so Hall terms them, "had now fair opportunities to work their own designs. They, therefore, taking the advantage of our restraint, renew that Bill of theirs, which had been twice before rejected since the beginning of this Session, for taking away the Votes of the Bishops in Parliament; and, in a very thin House, easily passed it: which once condescended unto, I know not by what strong importunity his Majesty's assent was drawn from him thereunto."^e

^a Rushworth, Edit. 1721. vol. iv. p. 467.

^b Hume, Hist. of Engl. chap. lv. an. 1641.

^c Life of Laud, p. 490.

^d Rushworth, *sup.*

^e "Hard Measure:" Works, vol. i. p. lvii. Could Hall have inquired of the Queen, she might have explained the mystery of the "importunity." See Heylyn, p. 493, and Hacket, Pt. ii. p. 181. "That day it broke forth, that the largest part of the Lords were fermentated with an anti-Episcopal sourness. If they had loved that Order, they would never have doomed them to a prison, and late at night, in bitter frost and snow." Hacket Pt. ii. p. 179.

It is not within our province to expatiate on the affair of the accusation of the Five Members, January the 3rd, 1641-2, and of its failure; that "unadvised and abortive attempt," which "completed the degradation of the unfortunate Monarch:"^a nor to show why "the whole world stood amazed at this important accusation, so suddenly entered upon, without concert, deliberation, or reflection:" nor yet to follow the story as it grows from one degree of amazement to another till the climax was come, "To your tents, O Israel!" Was ever King so depicted by his spontaneous and able advocate? "The King," says Hume, "apprehensive of danger from the enraged multitude, had retired to Hampton Court, deserted by all the world, and overwhelmed with grief, shame, and remorse, for the fatal measures into which he had been hurried. His distressed situation he could no longer ascribe to the rigours of destiny, or the malignity of enemies: his own precipitancy and indiscretion must bear the blame of whatever disasters should henceforth befall him. The most faithful of his adherents, between sorrow and indignation, were confounded with reflections on what had happened, and what was likely to follow. Seeing every prospect blasted, faction triumphant, the discontented populace inflamed to a degree of fury, they utterly despaired of success in a cause to whose ruin friends and enemies seemed equally to conspire."^b

The memorable Bill received the Royal signature February the 14th, 1641-2, which enacted "That no Archbishop, Bishop, or any other person in holy Orders, from February 15th then next ensuing, should have any seat or place, suffrage or voice, use or execute any power or authority in the Parliament of this Realm; nor should be of the Privy Council of his Majesty, his heirs, or successors; or Justices of the Peace of Oyer and Terminer, or Gaol-delivery; or execute any Temporal authority, by virtue of any Commission; but should be wholly disabled."^c A stupendous effort was this, against Churchmen, whose deep-rooted and wide-spread interests were intermingled with those of so innumerable and so potent connexions over the entire kingdom! It could never have been accomplished, so to speak, had not the Hierarchal Body brought themselves into universal disrepute, and completed the series of their misdoings by their Protestation in December: "that foolish and self-undoing Declaration."^d

The two Houses of Parliament being aware of the coming difficulties, prepared to meet them in part by their Ordinance of April 9th, 1642, thus; "The Lords and Commons do declare, That they intend a due and necessary Reformation of the Government and Liturgy of the Church, and to take away nothing in the one or other but what shall be evil and justly offensive, or at the least unnecessary and burdensome: And for the better effecting thereof, speedily to have consultation with godly and learned Divines: And because this will never, of itself, obtain the end sought therein, they will therefore use their utmost endeavour to establish learned and preaching Ministers with a good and sufficient maintenance throughout the whole kingdom, wherein many

^a Lingard's Hist. vol. vi. p. 426. See back, vol. i. p. 464. ^b *Ubi supra.*

^c Heylyn, p. 493.

^d Milton's Iconoclastes, chap. iv.

dark corners are miserably destitute of the means of salvation, and many poor ministers want necessary provision." ^a

The two Houses voted also a Remonstrance or Declaration, May the 26th, in answer to one "under his Majesty's name," concerning the affair of Hull, April the 23rd. This document is said to contain "the most frank avowal and exposition of the common rights and liberties of the People in the abstract, yet put forward." ^b They make herein jointly that striking avowal which has become the fixed principle of the British Constitution, that the "erroneous maxim" infused into Princes, "'That their kingdoms are their own; and that they may do with them what they will;—as if their kingdoms were for them, and not they for their kingdoms!—is the root of all the Subjects' misery, and of all the invading of their just rights and liberties.'" ^c

On the 22nd day of August, the King raised his Standard at Nottingham; and hostilities were hence declared in military form. "Thus, step by step, was the country led into that most direful of national calamities, a civil war. The Stuarts, seated on the Throne of the Tudors, doubted not that they were rightfully possessed of all those arbitrary powers claimed and exercised by their predecessors. But within the last fifty years the minds of men had undergone a wonderful revolution. It had become fashionable to study the principles of Government, and to oppose the rights of the Subject to the pretensions of the Sovereign. Elizabeth, with all the awe inspired by the firmness of her character, had been unable, towards the close of her reign, to check the expressions of liberal sentiments. Under the gentle sway of James, they were diffused with rapidity; and the necessities of Charles, arising from his wars and his debts, emancipated them altogether from restraint. Good sense should have taught him to go along with the general feelings of his people: but Princes, in all ages, have been slow to learn the important lesson, That the influence of authority must ultimately bend to the influence of opinion." ^d

September the 8th, the Commons passed resolutions against the "Reverend" Book of Sports; against the Popish garniture of crucifixes, pictures, images, tapers, and such like, upon and about Communion Tables; and against the corporal reverences made at the name Jesus, and towards the east. ^e These particulars were not all agreed to by the Lords, the Bishops not having yet lost all their influence. ^f Tumults arose, in consequence of the "threatening but idle speeches, and impotent denunciations of resentment" ^g among the Courtiers; and such means were adopted for suppressing them as accorded to the summary practice of the times.

While these affairs were in motion, the King, who had retired from one field of negotiation and of military array to another, during the

^a Vicars' "God in the Mount." 1642. 4to. p. 88.

^b Lardner's Cont. of Mackintosh's Hist. vol. v. p. 300.

^c Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 579.

^d Lingard's Hist. of Engl. 1825. 4to. vol. vi. p. 442.—See an admirable note on the influence of public opinion, in relation to this juncture, in Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs of Col. Hutchinson. Edit. 4. 1825. 8vo. vol. i. p. 152.

^e Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 386.

^f Rapin's Hist. fol. vol. ii. p. 382.

^g Hallam's Const. Hist. vol. i. ch. ix. p. 587.

summer months, had concentrated his army in September at Wellington, for the first time, when "his Majesty made this speech to his soldiers: 'Gentlemen,—You have heard these Orders read. It is your part, in your several places, to observe them exactly. The time cannot be long before we come to action; therefore you have the more reason to be careful: and I must tell you, I shall be very severe in the punishing of those, of what condition soever, who transgress these Instructions. I cannot suspect your courage and resolution: your *conscience* and your loyalty hath brought you hither, to fight for your religion, your King, and the laws of the Land. You shall meet with no enemies but traitors; most of them Brownists, Anabaptists, and Atheists; such who desire to destroy both Church and State, and who have already condemned you to ruin for being loyal to Us. That you may see what use I mean to make of your valour, if it please God to bless it with success, I have thought fit to publish my resolution to you in a Protestation; which, when you have heard me make, you will believe you cannot fight in a better quarrel, in which, I promise to live and die with you.'"^a His Majesty's restriction of his "enemies" to the parties named, is somewhat astounding, all things considered; for what was become even of all the Puritans or Presbyterians? Could it be, that they were merged among the "Atheists?" His Majesty placed those kindly in the *rear*, the furthest off, while he assigned the *van* to others who carried into the battle fully as much "conscience" as he ascribes to his supporters in his camp. We ask, for these, only an equitable allowance; believing that not even "Brownists" would resist "the ordinance of God,"^b if the *crime* of resistance had not been provoked by such an outrageous abuse of "the sword" of magistracy as drew down the visible vengeance of the Almighty on the chief abusers of His sacred "ordinance;" and that if "atheists" were indeed instruments in His hand, "God is the judge: He putteth down one, and setteth up another."^c

We regret to be obliged to state, that notwithstanding his Majesty had a few days previously, protested solemnly against the charge, yet on the 23rd of October, he avowed, in a Declaration, his having accepted the service of "some *few*" Papists of "eminent abilities in command and conduct."^d The Parliament having their apprehensions, had contracted a closer connexion with the Scots. They had written to the General Assembly, which was to meet in July, acquainting them with the crisis of their affairs, and that they had been interrupted in the promotion of "a due reformation, both in Church and State," by the plots and practices of "a malignant party of Papists and ill-affected persons." It is said, we believe inadvertently, that the "advice and assistance" of the Assembly was desired, on this occasion:^e but it does not appear in the correspondence preserved in the "Printed Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland;"^f where, however, the Assembly "do most willingly *offer* their prayers and uttermost endeavours for furthering so great a work."^g They commend their own

^a Clarendon, Hist. vol. ii. pt. i. p. 16.

^d Rushworth, vol. v. p. 31, 40.

^f Edin. 1682. 12mo. p. 124.

^b Rom. xiii. 2.

^c Psal. lxxv. 7.

^e Neal, vol. ii. chap. xi.

^g P. 129.

Commissioners "for beginning the work of reformation at the Uniformity of Kirk-government: for what hope can there be of Unity in religion, of one Confession of faith, one Form of worship, and one Catechism, till there be first one Form of Ecclesiastical Government?" They assumed what they found to be erroneous, that "the Prelatical hierarchy being put out of the way, the work will be easy, without forcing of any conscience, to settle, in England, the government of the Reformed Kirks by Assemblies." Taking, too, to themselves perpetuality, *jure Divino*, they profess to "long extremely for the day when Kings and Parliaments shall join for bringing to pass so great, so good a work:" when "all wars and commotions ceasing, all superstition, idolatry, sects, and schisms," shall be "removed!"^a Such is but another exposure of the vanity of human wishes and expectations: the Parliament, with more wisdom, replied that this is "hardly to be obtained punctually and exactly," but hoped that there might be "a free communion in all holy exercises and duties of worship;" for the "attaining whereof" they intended an Assembly of godly and learned Divines, so soon as the royal assent could be obtained.^b

A measure of the Commons, carried in a large house, by a hundred and fifty nine to a hundred and forty eight, November the 22nd, was a Remonstrance in which they embodied elaborately a catalogue of the grievances during the course of the past fifteen years. No other reason presents itself for this enumeration and present promulgation of what had already been partially or wholly accommodated, but the lively feeling of distrust which the House entertained about the continuance of what had been adjusted, and about the safety of themselves and their cause, if both were not fenced round with double and treble securities. They assure his Majesty, herein, that, "It is far from our purpose or desire to let loose the golden reins of Discipline and Government in the Church; to leave private persons, or Particular Congregations to take up what form of Divine service they please: for," say they, "we hold it requisite that there should be throughout the whole realm a conformity to that order which the laws enjoin, according to the Word of God." How far they were, at present, from possessing a liberal and correct knowledge of the principles of religious freedom, this passage evinces; but that they entertained a determination to meliorate the condition of those who sought to worship their Maker agreeably to what such considered to be the dictates of conscience, is evident where they say, "We desire to unburden the consciences of men, of needless and superstitious Ceremonies, suppress Innovations, and take away the monuments of Idolatry." To effect this intended reformation, they add, "We desire there may be a general Synod of the most grave, pious, learned, and judicious Divines of this Island, assisted with some from foreign parts professing the same religion with us, who may consider of all things necessary for the peace and good government of the Church, and represent the result of their consultations unto the Parliament, to be there allowed of and confirmed, and receive the stamp of authority."^c Dissensions grew out of this Remonstrance, and the accompanying

^a P. 130, 131.

^b Rushworth, vol. v. p. 391.

^c Nalson's "Collection," vol. ii. p. 705.

Petition, between the two Houses, which induced the Commons to commence a system of agitation among the populace; and the pulpits were converted into drums ecclesiastic, as they were wont to be by their inveterate opponents. Attack and defence, oppression and resistance, are commutable terms; but to decide in all cases, to whom is to be ascribed the one or the other of them, is not always practicable in times of commotion; what reproach is the due of either party, each must endure: *Iliacos intra muros peccatur, et extra.*^a Hume admits^b that the views of the Commons were more "solid and profound," but he describes their language to be "severe and indecent."^c By what process of reasoning, what deduction of inferences, what peculiarity of penetration, he was enabled to conclude that the Commons "were therefore resolved, if possible, to excite" the king "to some violent passion, in hopes that he would commit indiscretions of which they might take the advantage," surpasses our faculty of apprehension, if the passage were penned with any other design than to appear to account for the appalling indiscretion into which Charles had already irretrievably fallen. "The Queen and the ladies of the Court" urged him on towards destruction, instead of restraining that "fatal impetuosity" which was the precursor of so lamentably disastrous an issue.

The founders of those Civil liberties which their posterity enjoy, had already committed oversights, and were now themselves carried away with precipitancy; yet who shall venture to deny the fact, that they were on all occasions placed in circumstances of peculiar imminence and urgency?^d The fruits of this great struggle are our heritage and our boast. The King, it is said, "never took up a position from which he was not forced to recede," while the advance of the Parliament "was made with a steady unerring pace; which proved, at once, superior sagacity and power."^e

^a Hor. Ep. ii. lib. 1.

^b Chap. lv. an. 1641.

^c How is the following diversity of judgment to be accounted for? Hallam writes thus, "The temperate and constitutional language of the royal declarations and answers to the House of Commons in 1642, known to have proceeded from the pen of Hyde; as superior to those on the opposite side in argument as they were in eloquence." P. 612. Mackintosh, or Lardner, the continuator of his History, 1835. 12mo. vol. v. p. 298, writes, "The King's papers, drawn up by Clarendon, have been pronounced, by one writer after another, greatly superior to those of the Commons: . . . Clarendon's drafts, . . . exhibit only diffuse rhetoric and flimsy dialects, approaching to pettyfogging; while the papers of the Parliament were no less remarkable for frankness, point, and brevity."

^d See Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 518, 519.—"If any one have a desire of more particular information, there were so many books then written, as will sufficiently give it them: and although those of our enemies are all fraught with abominable lies, yet if all ours were suppress, even their own writings, impartially considered, would be a sufficient chronicle of their injustice and oppression!" Memoirs of Col. Hutchinson. vol. i. p. 104.

^e Lardner's Cont. of Mackintosh, vol. v. p. 302. Whatever be the impression which might have been made by the former note from Lardner, we shall avail ourselves of the noble writer's authority, when recording his judgment concerning the members generally of his own Profession, and the relative importance of their position in the State. On having recorded the proceedings in the House of Commons, that they pressed that the impeached Bishops "might be sequestered from the [Upper] House, till they should be brought to judgment;" Clarendon goes on to say, "And for this, they found Lawyers in their House, who, prostituting the dignity and learning of their profession to the cheap and vile affectation of popular

CHAP. XLIII.

COTTON'S CONSTITUTION OF A CHURCH;—HIS ANSWER TO BALL.—
BREWSTER.

Notwithstanding the surrounding din of arms, there were even now those who sought to "exalt" the Lord their God, and "worship at His

applause, were not ashamed to aver custom and law for their senseless proposition." This is in keeping with his design, to make right wrong, when it should be expedient: but now comes what demands the most considerate attention, because it lets in a flood of light which shows that disaffection had not become rampant in the Church alone, but that it had spread in the same degree among that learned profession whose ordinary boast it is that the "essence of reason" is concentrated in the products of their labours and the results of their wisdom! We shall see presently, to what a height animosity had grown "between some great Lawyers and some great Churchmen:" and this is the subject demanding that attention we require, for whether by accident or artifice, yet so it is that in all discussions, private or public, touching the ill favour of the Bishops in those times, the Puritans! the Puritans! the Separatists, the Fanatics! constitute the one cry which carries away the judgment of the unwary, and precludes the inquiry at large, How came those Bishops and their predecessors to conduct themselves so as to create a fatal schism in the educated body they were appointed to govern; and, moreover, to provoke the "animosity" of that other body whose distinctive appellation is "Learned"?

Where "judgment" should have been looked for, "behold oppression;" where "righteousness, behold a cry!" Isai. v. 7. This is verified on the unquestionable authority of Hyde himself, he who came to be the head of his order,—Lord High Chancellor of England.

"And here I cannot but with grief and wonder remember the virulency and animosity expressed at that time upon all occasions, by many of good knowledge, in the excellent and wise Profession of the Common Law, towards the Church and Churchmen; taking all opportunities uncharitably to improve mistakes into crimes, and unreasonably to transfer and impute the follies and faults of particular men to the malignity of their order and function; and so, whet and sharpen the edge of the Law to wound the Church in its Jurisdiction, and at last to cut it up by the roots and demolish its foundation. It cannot be denied, that the peevish spirits of some clergymen have taken great pains to alienate that Profession from them; and others, as unskillfully—finding that in former times, when the religion of the State was a vital part of its policy, many Churchmen were employed eminently in the civil Government of the kingdom—imputed their wanting those ornaments their predecessors wore to the power and prevalency of the Lawyers, of whom some principal men, in all times, they could not but observe to have been their avowed enemies; and so, believed the straitening and confining the Profession of the Common Law must naturally extend and enlarge the Jurisdiction of the Church. Thence arose their bold and unwarrantable opposing and protesting against Prohibitions and other proceedings at Law, on the behalf of Ecclesiastical Courts; and the procuring some orders and privileges from the King, on the behalf of the Civil Law, even with an exclusion of the other: as the Archbishop of Canterbury prevailed with the King, to direct 'That half the Masters of the Chancery should be always Civil Lawyers,' and to declare 'That no others, of what condition soever, should serve him as Masters of Request:' all which was a great mistake. For, besides, the stopping Prohibitions was an envious breach upon the justice of the kingdom, which at some time or other will still be too hard for the strongest opposers and oppressors of it; I could never yet know, why the Doctors of the Civil Law were more of kin to the Bishops, or the Church, than the Common Lawyers were? To say, that their places were in the Bishops' disposal, as chancellors, commissaries, and the like; and therefore that their persons were more like to be at their disposal too; at least, to pay them greater reverence; concludes nothing: for the Clergy had opportunity enough to oblige and create an equal dependence from the Pro-

footstool." ^a For this purpose some of them found means to obtain help from afar. Application had been made, we are told, by "several of the leading members in both Houses of Parliament," to one, at least, of the voluntary exiles from that abounding tyranny which had made the cries of its victims mount to the very heavens, and invoke the compassion of the only "KING" who could "command deliverances," ^b to "return to his native country." ^c But the privations and security of an uncultivated foreign land were sweet and consoling to all who, with Cotton, could say from observation and experience, that the Ecclesiastical Courts at home, were "dens of lions," and "mountains of leopards." ^d Those, he said, who have to do with them "have found them to be markets of the sins of the people; the cages of uncleanness; the forgers of extortion; the tabernacles of bribery; and, contrary to the end of Civil government." ^e On declining the solicitation to return when "the snare of the fowlers" was "broken," ^f it was, perhaps, that he transmitted certain of his manuscripts adapted to existing exigences; among which, might be "The True Constitution of a Particular Visible Church, proved by Scripture: Wherein is briefly Demonstrated by Questions and Answers, What Officers, Worship, and Government, Christ hath Ordained in His Church. By that Reverend Learned Divine, Mr. John Cotton, B. D., and Pastor of Boston in New England.—Jer. l. 5.—Lond. 1642." 4to. pp. 13. ^g

This work is without preface, or other introduction. Under the question, "How is the public worship of God to be ordered and administered in the Church?" and after that, relating to Prayer; and, in one

fession of the Common Law; and I am persuaded the stewardships to Bishops and of the lands of the Church, which were to be managed by the rules of Common Law, were not much inferior in profit to all the Chancellorships in England. And then, if, where the policy may consist with justice, it is no ill measure in making friendships to look into and compare the power of doing hurt or doing good; it is apparent that the Civil Law in this kingdom had not, in the least degree, the ability to help or to hurt the Church in any exigency, as the Common Law had; whose professors had always by their interests, experience, and reputation, so great an influence upon the civil state, upon Court and Country, that they were notable friends or enemies. And the dependence of the Church as to their inheritance and estates—except their minute tithes—was entirely upon the Law; being only determinable by those rules by which they have seldom received eminent injustice. And truly, I have never yet spoken with one Clergyman who hath had the experience of both litigations, that hath not ingenuously confessed 'He had rather in the respect of his trouble, charge, and satisfaction to his understanding, have three suits depending in Westminster Hall than one in the Arches', or any Ecclesiastical Court.'" History of the Rebellion. vol. i. pt. ii. bk. iv. p. 305.

^a Psal. xcix. 5.

^b Psal. xlv. 4.

^c Mather's Hist. of New Eng. Bk. iii. p. 20—23.

^d Sol. Song. iv. 8,

^e Brook's Hist. Purit. vol. iii. p. 155.

^f Psal. cxxiv. 7.

^g Reprinted under the title of "The Doctrine of the Church, to which are committed the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Wherein is demonstrated by way of Question and Answer, What a Visible Church is, according to the Order of the Gospel: And, What Officers, Members, Worship and Government, Christ hath ordained in the New Testament. By that Reverend and Learned Divine, Mr. John Cotton, B. D., and Teacher of the Church in Boston, in New England.—The second Edition. Printed according to a more exact Copy. The marginal Proofs, in the former Edition misplaced, being herein placed more directly; and many other faults both in the Line and Margent are here corrected: and some few Proofs and Words are added in the margent, for the better preventing or satisfying of some doubts in some Controversial Points. Lond. 1643. 4to. pp. 13.

of the answers, stating that "if set Forms of Public Prayer devised and ordained by men," "had been an ordinance of the Lord and a worship acceptable to him, the Lord himself, or at least some of the Apostles or Prophets, would not have held back that part of God's counsel from the Church;" Cotton says,^a "Before Prophesying, it will be seasonable to sing a Psalm;^b and by some of the Teachers of the Church, to read the Word, and therewith to preach it by giving the sense and applying the use.^c In dispensing whereof, the Minister was wont to stand above all the people in a pulpit of wood, and the Elders on both sides;^d while the people hearkened unto them with reverence and attention.^e Where there be more Prophets, as Pastors and Teachers, they may prophesy two or three:^f and, if the time permit, the Elders may call any other of the Brethren, whether of the same Church or any other, to speak a word of exhortation to the people.^g And for the better edifying a man's self, or others, it may be lawful for any, young or old, save only for women, to ask questions at the mouth of the Prophets."^h

"The Government of the Church is, in Christ our Head, Kingly or regal;ⁱ but in the Church, stewardly and ministerial;^k and in both of them, spiritual and heavenly: . . . as being ordained, not by the wisdom and power of this world, but of Christ;^l and administered not according to the precepts of men, but His commandments;^m not by earthly weapons, but by the Word and Sacraments, and other spiritual ordinances:ⁿ not working upon the bodies, or outward estates of men, by fines or imprisonments, loss of limbs or lives; but upon their souls and consciences, by the evidence of the Spirit:^o finally, not aiming at worldly peace, wealth, or honour; but at the righteousness of faith, peace of conscience, and joy in the Holy Ghost."^p

"The body of the Church hath power, from Christ, to choose and call her own officers and members; to send forth any of them for her service;^q to inquire, and hear, and assist, in the judgment of all public scandals.^r It is committed to the Presbytery to call the Church together,^s and to deliver the counsel of God to them with authority;^t to prepare matters for the Church's hearing,^u and to propound and order them in the Assembly;^v to administer ordination,^w and censures;^x and, to dismiss the Assembly with a blessing, in the Name of the Lord."^y

Such as the above, would seem to be the earliest usage under the sanction of this devoted servant of the only Head of the true Church. Another of his productions, bearing the same date, has, to us, the additional interest of being "A modest and clear Answer to Mr. Ball's Discourse of Set Forms of Prayer: Set forth in a most seasonable

^a P. 6. ^b Col. iii. 16. ^c Neh. viii. 8; Acts xv. 21; Luke iv. 21, 23—28.

^d Neh. viii. 4, 5. ^e Verse 5. ^f Ver. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 29.

^g Acts, xiii. 15; 1 Cor. xiv. 31. ^h Psal. ii. 6; Isai. xxxiii. 22.

ⁱ Matt. xvi. 19; 1 Cor. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10. ^k John xviii. 36.

^l 1 Cor. ii. 6—8. ^m Matt. xxviii. 20. ⁿ 2 Cor. x. 4.

^o Heb. xiii. 7; 2 Cor. x. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 4. ^p John xvi. 33; Rom. xiv. 17.—P. 8, 9.

^q 2 Cor. viii. 19, 23. ^r Acts xi. 23; Matt. xviii. 17; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5; Acts xv. 33.

^s Acts vi. 2; Joel i. 13, 14. ^t Tit. ii. 15. ^u Acts xxi. 18. ^v Acts ix. 13, 15.

^w 1 Tim. iv. 14. ^x 1 Tim. i. 20. ^y Num. vi. 23 —P. 10.

time, when this Kingdom is now in Consultation about Matters of that Nature ; and so many Godly long after the Resolution in that Point. Written by the Reverend and Learned John Cotton, B. D., and Teacher of the Church of Christ at Boston in New England. Lond. 1642." 4to. pp. 49.^a This piece enables us to take a portion of that further notice of Ball's "Friendly Trial" which it is intimated "would come under review."^b

Cotton tells his opposite, that, for his purpose, it is enough that Prayer, in general, is the lifting up of the desires of the heart for Divine blessings ; such as God only can give : and lawful prayer, when it is "according to His will, in the Name of Jesus Christ, by the help of the Spirit of Grace." This being premised, he remarks upon so many of Ball's "rules" as "more nearly touch upon the cause."

Chap. i. "You say, It is not a prayer as penned, or printed, but as rehearsed with understanding, feeling of wants, humility, confidence."^c Cotton concludes on this, That a means, help, and form of prayer, must either find warrant from the Word, or fall under the breach of the second commandment. Ball says, "The controversy is not of this or that prescript form, in particular ; much less of one, for substance of matter, faulty and erroneous ; but of a prescript form *in general*, Whether it be lawful to use any set form of prayer at all, though for the matter thereof, never so sound and allowable ?"^d Cotton remarks upon the phrase, "in general," That under this cover, men may be persuaded to join such a prescript form as is justly liable to manifold exceptions. "If such," he adds, "as were compelled to worship the Lord before the golden calves at Dan and Bethel, should put the state of the question, not of such particular calves, but of calves, or cherubim *in general*,—for one form of cherubim were like calves,—Whether it be not lawful to worship the Lord before any cherubim at all ? it may be easily conceived what the issue would be ! The question admitteth the lawfulness of some cherubim *in general*,—which is out of question ; the practice will conclude the lawfulness of Jeroboam's 'calves' *in particular*, which made Israel to sin!"^e Upon Ball's acknowledgment, That neither Christ nor his apostles prescribed any set form ; and therefore that no prescript form of prayer or liturgy is simply necessary :^f this argues, Cotton replies, not only "no necessity, but also no expediency thereof to the edification of the church ; unless it might be presumed, that there is some help, or means, of God's worship expedient to the edification of the church, which never came into the heart of Christ and of his apostles to commend unto the church ! . . . If tying to set forms be requisite to supply the defects of the gifts of ignorant ministers, then, thereby a cloak is made for the covering and sheltering of ignorant ministers ; who had more need to be shouldered speedily out of the church, than

^a It appeared also without a date, in 16mo. pp. 90. "Published for the benefit of those who desire satisfaction in that point." The anonymous editors say, "Courteous Reader, we think it not meet to fall a commending the Author. . . This only we say, Thou wilt discern, as some other godly learned who have perused it before, also have done,—such a clear judgment, dexterous aptness, and pithy plainness, in a moderate and brotherly style, . . . that thou wilt think thou *seest* the very spirit of the author *breathing* in every page and line."

^b See back, p. 47.

^c Ball, p. 3.

^d *Ib.*

^e 1 Kings xii. 30.

^f P. 4.

to be sheltered therein one day to an end ^a. . . A man may give unto another holy directions and rules for prayer, and may also set down some forms of prayer as examples of such rules ; but not to prescribe them as set forms to him, to be used by him for his prayers. . . We deny not, that a man that is affected by some petitions in a prayer devised by others, may lawfully make use of them, and intersert them ordinarily into his own prayers. . . We grant, magistrates, or other christians, may commend such heads or petitions to the Church, according to the present state of things ; which the Church, as they see fit, may present and commend to God *in their* prayers. Thus far we consent ; but further we cannot go, but rather conceive it to be unlawful to set apart and take up a set form of prayer, and to use as an ordinary prayer, that which is devised by others whom God hath not called to be a mouth to us. We conceive it, also, to be unlawful to bring in, ordinarily, any other books into the public worship of God in the Church, besides the Book of God ; and, therefore, do see no more warrant to read out of a prayer-book the public prayers of a church, than out of a book of homilies to read the public sermons of the ministers of the Church. We account it alike, if not more, unlawful, for ancestors to prescribe or enjoin set forms of prayers to their posterity ; or for one church to prescribe set forms of prayer unto another. . . Proceed we now, to consider the weight of the reasons which you give for your judgment and practice.

Chap. ii. If it could be proved, that the reading of a prescript form of prayer upon a book, were an ordinance of God, sanctified for the edification of the church, as the reading of the Scriptures is, we might ordinarily expect the like assistance and blessing in reading of the one as well as of the other. The comparison would be more suitable if, instead of 'reading the Scriptures', were put the 'reading of sermons and homilies' in the church ; for which we find as little warrant as for reading of prayers ; nor can we expect a greater blessing upon the one than upon the other. We do not deny that read prayer may 'lead' and affect 'the heart ;' as may a sermon read at home : but then, neither is such a read prayer prescribed by others, nor set apart by me as my prayer, no more than the reading of such a sermon is my preaching : . . He that giveth the Word to be read can give the affections to read it withal, and hath promised so to do ; which the sons of men, that give us prescript forms of prayer to be read, cannot do. . . What, though there might be some colour to put a set form of sound words of catechism into the mouths of children and novices, the better to help their memories and capacities ; will it therefore argue it to be a 'reasonable service' of God, to put a set form of words and prayers into the mouths of ministers, to help their memories and capacities in pouring out their own and the church's petitions unto God ? . . Reading of the Scripture in the church, is an ordinance of God : so is the reading of it in a tongue which the people understand ; and therefore it is an ordinance of God, that the Word be read in some translation ! But the reading of a prayer, for the prayer of the church, is no ordinance of God ; therefore

^a "The Liturgy hath been a great means . . to make and increase an idle and unedifying ministry."—Directory, 1644-5. Pref. p. 4.

there is not the like ground from the Word, to make use of prayer-books to read prayers, as to make use of a printed Bible for the reading of the Word. Every minister . . ought to make use of his own gift in examining the truth of the translation which he readeth unto the church; which will not be allowed in prescript liturgies! . . We know no warrant, that one church should prescribe another what division to make of the Scriptures, or what part of it should be read this day, and what the next. What God hath left free let no man limit! . . As devised worship is unlawful, so are devised forms and means of worship unlawful also: of which sort, such set forms of words be as are devised and composed by the officers of one congregation, and imposed upon the brethren of another congregation for the forms of their prayers. . . It is not the same form of walking, to walk with crutches, and to walk upright: it is not the same form of prayer, to pray with help of men's inventions, and with such helps only as the Holy Ghost supplieth. . . For, in conceived prayer, the Spirit of God within us teacheth us what to pray: and for that, the ordinance and word of God is plain, Rom. viii. 26. But in stinted prayer, the matter is not suggested or endited to us by the Spirit of God within us, but prescribed and imposed upon us by the will, wisdom, and authority of men whom the 'Holy Ghost' hath not called to such a work. . . A set form of prayer, as it is set by one congregation for another, can find no rule of direction, nor any footstep thereof, in the Word of Truth. . . If every minister be to edify the church by the dispensation of his own talents and gifts, as well in prayer as in preaching; then he may not pray another man's penned prayer, no more than preach another man's penned sermon: but the former is true,—1 Cor. xii. 7; Acts vi. 4; Eph. iv. 8, 11—13,—therefore the latter. . . If it be an unsanctified way of preaching, to fill a sermon with quotations out of the books of ancient divines—whom more commonly than falsely, they call Fathers—though the sentences be godly and pithy; how much more will it be an unsanctified kind of prayer, to make up not only many petitions together, but also a whole form of prayer, out of a book less ancient and much more offensive. . . Since, then, the second commandment is so many ways violated by reading of a prayer-book, devised and prescribed by human authority, for the public prayers of the Church, the Lord pardon all our provocations of his *jealousy* by our former ignorance in this point, and keep us blameless for after times; for his Name's sake. . .

Chap. iii. . . The occasion of the question in hand springeth from an offence taken at some brethren,—as appeareth by the Letters sent to us, about the matter, by sundry reverend godly brethren, and subscribed, amongst others, by your own name,—for their not joining with others to worship God in a common stinted liturgy, known to be devised by *men*, and prescribed to be read for the public prayers of all the churches in the country.^a Howsoever, therefore, the question be reduced by your discourses *ab hypothesi ad thesin*,—and, by lawful rules of dispute, so may be,—yet, it is against the rule, μεταβαινῆν εἰς ἄλλα γνόμενον, so to palliate the matter; as to draw the question above the kind and occasion of the question, you may upon occasion of *one* prescript form of prayer devised by men, put the question of *any* prescript form

^a See back, p. 18.

of prayer devised by men; but it is an utter changing and forsaking of the cause, to put off the question in hand to forms of prayer devised and prescribed by God! What though some, that have spoken or written in this cause, have waived some forms of prayers devised by God himself, and have used some arguments that grasp at more than they can hold; the state of the question must not be drawn to the arguments, but the arguments to the state of the question. It is true, some have doubted, and some have denied, the use of the Lord's prayer, as it is called, for a prayer; but they would never have denied it, or doubted it, if they had thought it had been prescribed by Christ *for* a prayer! But howsoever—not to spend words and time in vain—we, for our parts,—I speak for the most part,—do grant it may be lawful to pray that very prayer in the same words; and yet this will not at all prejudice the cause in hand, to justify prayer in a book composed by *men*, and imposed by one church upon another. . . . Though it do appear from Scripture, that some forms of prayers, or blessing, or baptizing, or thanksgiving, devised by God, were sometimes used by godly men—and it was lawful so to do—yet we deny that God, in his Word, did set down any prescript form of these. Prescript, I say, in such a sense as, in this question, is intended; to wit, precisely enjoining the use thereof in all their public holy assemblies: nor will any of the Scriptures alleged reach that. . . . When shall once it be, that the servants of God will learn to be wise, and teach others to be wise, not above that which is written, but according to it; that so an end might be put, at length, to the inventions and innovations of the sons of men, whereby they take upon themselves a usurpation beyond the bounds of apostolical authority, and put upon the people an unjust restraint of the bounds of their dear-bought Christian liberty? . . . It is true, that every good minister is not able, at all times, to open his heart to God in [free] prayer; but neither is he able, at all times, to open the mind of God in preaching: but if he be not able to do both without book, neither will he be able to do either upon a book prescribed to him. I have known a minister to edify the people more by silence in the pulpit, through strength of temptation, than ever I knew any to do by reading a homily upon the book. . . .

Chap. iv. . . . In the people's joining in prayer, there is no more required but their going along in silence, with consent of the heart; and, in the end of the prayer, expressing their consent in voice, by saying 'Amen,' 1 Cor. xiv. 16; but in singing of psalms, all the people of God, as spiritual priests, do sing 'with voice together,' according to Isai. lii. 8; which putteth a necessity upon a set form of psalms, else one should sing one thing, and another another thing, which would, instead of harmony, breed confusion. . . . We are to teach and admonish ourselves and one another by the singing of psalms unto the Lord, Col. iii. 16: we have, therefore, a lawful warrant to sing such psalms, even in such a form of words as they are translated into by *men*; when yet we have not the like warrant to pray the forms of prayers devised by ordinary men, which are not of Divine inspiration, but of *human* invention and injunction. . . . Common sense maketh it evident [that] a man may join in prayer, and attend to the Word preached, as well in a new form of words, according to the present occasion, which he never heard

before, as in a set form which he heareth every day. . . . Whatsoever is required of the people by Divine institution, for joining in prayer, is fully attained without a set form of words in prayer ; which cannot be attained in singing without a set form of words. . . . The Holy Ghost hath commanded that the Word of God should dwell in us plenteously, 'teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs,' Colos. iii. 16 ; who hath also commanded, that we should 'sing with understanding,' 1 Cor. xiv. 15. . . . The Scriptures cannot be translated into our mother tongue without the help of grammar ; nor can the Psalms, into verse and metre, without the help of poetry [figures,] nor be sung without the help of music—natural music, at the least ;—and therefore these kind of helps we make use of as not being means of worship devised or suggested by the wit or will of man, but as they are indeed prepared and ordained—according to the light of nature—by God : and so not falling under the general negative precept which forbiddeth all human inventions and injunctions in the worship of God. . . . There is no 'necessity' at all for a devised set form of prayer, unless it be through the sinful defect of the minister's gifts in prayer ; which is such a 'necessity' as God abhorreth both it and the minister for it : but the 'necessity' of a set form of psalms is such which God himself hath put, for the celebration of that service with one accord, both in heart and voice. . . .

Chap. v. . . . No man is called of God to be a *minister* of His church, but he is as well apt to pray as apt to preach. . . . Of *private* persons, it is true, many good souls have better desires than utterance ; in regard of which defect, or without such defect, we willingly condescend [that] it is lawful, yea, and necessary, to [such a one] to use all godly means to stir up the graces of God in him, and to premeditate how to utter his requests in such sort as best serves for his own quickening and the edification of others. But this we deny, That the using of a prescript form of prayer upon a book, devised and imposed by one man upon another, to be used as their prayer, is a godly means to stir up the graces of God in himself, or to edify others : for that which the Holy Ghost hath not sanctified in his Word, for the stirring up of the graces of God in a man's self, or others, that is not a godly means for such an end : . . . it is but an image, which will rather teach a form of godliness, than edify to the power of it. . . . It is lawful to use any external or internal helps,—either before prayer, to prepare for it, or in prayer, to quicken or enlarge us in it,—provided they be such means and helps as God hath sanctified to such an end at such a time. As we readily grant the help of books and meditation before prayer, so we do grant also the help of holy and reverent gestures in prayer,—as bowing down the knees, and lifting up of the hands and eyes and voice ; the presence and assistance of a christian friend,—for all these God hath sanctified to help the inward affections of the heart in prayer. Do but show that God hath sanctified book-prayers imposed upon us for our prayers, and, that by the members of other congregations ; and we will . . . willingly bless the Lord for his goodness, . . . like as Phineas and the congregation of Israel blessed God for the Reubenites and Gadites that were able to give so good an account of their actions, beyond the expectation of their

brethren ? ^a . . . If some forms of prayers,—especially such as gave occasion to this dispute,—do now seem to be as ‘bread’ to the ‘hungry,’ we say no more but this, Then hungry souls will never be starved that never want store of such like bread as this is ! . . . The Word of God speaketh expressly that Christ ‘lifted up his eyes to heaven’ in prayer ; ^b so did David ; ^c and God hath ingrafted it in the hearts of all his people, to express the lifting up their souls, their faith, and hope, and desires, to God, by lifting up their eyes steadfastly to heaven in prayer. ^d . . .

Chap. vi. . . It is a usurpation of more than *prophetical* or *apostolical* authority, to prescribe a set form of liturgy to the churches ; and a greater usurpation for one congregation to prescribe the same to another : which is a sin both against the second and fifth commandments. It is a sinful and disloyal betraying the souls of magistrates, to countenance their intruding such prescript forms of prayers upon churches, by taking up such forms from them which they have not authority from God to enjoin, and stiffly to plead for them : a sin forbidden in the fifth and sixth commandments. . .

Chap. vii. . . God himself hath set before us sundry forms of Catechism. David’s catechism was of one form, ^e Solomon’s of another, ^f the Apostles’ of another ; yea, the Apostles name the heads of their catechism, ^g but neither propound the questions nor answers then in use : an evident argument, they never meant to bind churches to set forms of catechism. The excellent and necessary use of catechising young men and novices, we willingly acknowledge ; but, little benefit have we seen reaped from set forms of questions and answers, devised by one church and imposed, by necessity, upon another. . . The like may be said of forms of Confessions. When a church is suspected and slandered, with corrupt and unsound doctrine, they have a call from God to set forth a public confession of their faith : but to prescribe the same, as the confession of the faith of that church, to their posterity ; or to prescribe the confession of one church, to be a form and pattern unto others ; sad experience hath showed what a snare it hath been to both. . .

Chap. viii. . . A set form of prayer, prescribed to me for my prayer, maketh, to me, a will-worship of that which he that conceived the prayer might, lawfully, have pronounced. . . The reading of a sermon, for preaching, is a sinful manner of preaching. The difference will ever hold between the Word read and preached : they are two distinct ordinances.

Chap. ix. The Jews, before the coming of Christ, did use certain rites in Keeping the Passover ; . . and some forms of prayers : but it doth not at all appear, that they used any set forms of prayers but only to that and the like effect ; and that not by prescript or injunction from one to another, but leaving every father of a family at his liberty therein ; much less will it appear, that our Lord Jesus Christ took up any set forms of prayers by their example, and least of all from their injunction !

^a Josh. xxii.

^d Psal. cxlv. 15.

^g Heb. vi. 2.

^b John xvii. 1 ; xi. 41.

^e Psal. xxxiv. 11—14.

^c Psal. cxxiii. 1.

^f Prov. iv.

Chap. x. . . We know none of all the Reformed foreign churches that do prescribe a set form of prayer, with necessity to be observed ; but leave their ministers at liberty to use the same or some other form to the like effect, at their own discretion ; which taketh off a great part of the sin and burden of set forms. God knoweth how to pass by the remnant of iniquity of the transgression of them that seek him in truth, although all the 'high places' be not 'taken away.'^a . . Who knoweth not, they have all been more studious and tenacious of what form the doctrine, and worship, and discipline was, left unto them, than inquisitive after further light ; yea, sometimes more inclinable to look back into Egypt, than to hasten towards Canaan ? . . Seeing our faith resteth only on the Word of the Lord and his Spirit breathing therein ; and, the Word hath promised [that] more and more light shall break forth in these times, till Antichrist be utterly confounded and abolished ; we shall sin against the grace and word of Truth, if we confine our truth either to the divines of present or former ages ! . . The argument from the practice and judgment of churches, was of greater force in the apostles' time than ever since. The estate of the churches as then, remained *tanquam intemerata virgo* while the apostles and the apostolic men lived : men that could not err themselves, and were more watchful and zealous than to suffer any error to get head in any of the churches. But let them that press the like argument now, let them show us the like infallibility, vigilancy, and zeal, of the guides of the churches in these days, and we shall readily captivate our own judgments to such Divine testimony ! . .

Chap. xi. . . We conceive that good reason may be showed, why,—if it be unlawful for the minister to pray, upon a book, a devised and prescript form of prayer,—it is unlawful likewise for the people so to be present at it, or to join with it, or seem to join with it : . . if, then, it be 'unlawful' for the minister, . . it is alike 'unlawful' for the people to join with him. . . No man can be freed from the guilt of such 'coldness' as the minister and the people do contract, by the customary use of such devised prescript forms of prayers, if he do not, so much as in him lieth, remove such occasions of evil. . . We do not separate from the church and assembly of the saints ; but willingly join with you in every part of your holy worship, and in every doctrine of your holy faith ; only we withdraw ourselves from such parts of your administration wherein we cannot join with you."

The companion to this piece of Cotton's, as arising out of that portion of the "Friendly Trial" which concerns what Ball styles "The primitive subject and first receptacle of the power of the Keys," will be brought under consideration in another place.^b

^a 2 Chron. xv. 17.

^b Because of the insight acquired by it into the sort of commotions to which society was then subjected, we append to our other memorials of 1642, "The Anatomy of the Separatists, *alias* 'Brownists;' the factious Brethren of these Times: Wherein this Seditious Sect is fairly dissected, and perspicuously discovered to the view of [the] World. With the strange Hubbub, and formerly unheard of Hurlyburly, which those fanatic and fantastic Schismatics made on Sunday in the Afternoon, being the 8th of May, in the Parish of St. Olave in the Old Jewry, at the Sermon of the Rt. Rev. Father in God, Henry, Bishop of Chi-

In obedience to the injunction,—“Render therefore to all their chester; in the presence of the Rt. Hon. the Lord Mayor of this renowned Metropolis, and divers worthy Members of the Hon. House of Commons. 1642.” 4to. pp. 6. “It is too true,” we are told, p. 1, “that many places in the kingdom of England and in this city of London, are too much Amsterdammified by brainless opinions and several senses which, indeed, are senseless senses in religion. Religion is become common table-talk; the ordinary discourse at our very Commons and Ordinaries, where a man shall hardly find four together of one mind. . . One, out of zeal somewhat inconsiderate, cries down Episcopacy as antichristian; another, very moderate, wishes earnestly Episcopacy were reformed and purged from the Romish and tyrannical government that encumbers it; a third kind of men, carried by a contrary wind, maintain Episcopacy to be ‘jure Divino’: . . from these premises of discord and faction, needs must there proceed much tumult and distraction, to the great disgrace and scandal of the true Protestant religion. . . These [Brownists, p. 2] are the late up-start sectaries of this age, the new crept-in caterpillars of our kingdom, that do more mischief daily than any sect whatsoever: . . they are so many for their multitude, that like bees they swarm amongst us. Indeed the time was when they crept in corners, but now they are like the Egyptian locusts, covering the whole land. Ye may know them by their frequent and far-fetched sighs; the continual elevation of their eyes; their meagre physiognomies, solitary countenances, sharp noses; by the cut of their hair, made even with the top of their prick-ears—for their hair is as short as their eye-brows, though their consciences be as vast as the ocean.—Ye may further discern them by their broad hats and narrow ruffs which they usually wear; the putting of their gloves under their girdles, and the folding of their hands one within another. . . Their lives are hypocritical,” so it is said in p. 4; “Their positions schismatical; their thoughts perilous; their words malicious; their acts mischievous, and their opinions impious! . . They have made so many uproars,” p. 5, “the like in pristine ages unparalleled: motions and commotions in our Churches of late days; in the cathedral of St. Paul within these few months; and in St. Olave’s Church . . the 8th of May . . a company of rude rascals to the number of above a hundred, as soon as the Rt. Rev. pious and learned Bishop came up into the pulpit in his lawn sleeves and other vestments suitable to a prelate, presently . . made such a hideous clamour, crying jointly, most impudently, and with one accord, ‘a pope, a pope, a pope;’ to the astonishment of the man of God, and to the admiration and amazement of the Lord Mayor, the Parliament gentlemen, and their noble and worthy auditors. . . Some of the varlets ran out of the church; others, by the Lord Mayor’s officers were thrust out. . . I would not be accounted uncharitable, therefore my opinion is, that these sons of tumult bare no violent malice to the Rt. Rev. Bishop’s person—for he is the object of every man’s love,—only I imagine their inveterate spleen aimed at his function; a pope and a bishop are all one with them. . . P. 6.”

The above was followed by “A Letter sent to My Lord Mayor and his Venerable Brethren: By no Atheist, no Papist, no Arminian, no Anabaptist, no Familist, no Separatist or Brownist; but an honest Believing Protestant, and that, because that ‘Separatist,’ otherwise called Brownist, was, in many men’s account, said and held to be worse than Papist. Written by A. S. 1642.” 8vo. pp. 6. This advocate, who subscribes himself “Aron Streater, Divine; and Licensed Physician,” tells their Worshipships that “Separatists called ‘Brownists’ . . are a people very desirous to make the Scripture the rule and pattern of their lives and actions. . . And according to these rules, do that sect of Separatists called ‘Brownists’ walk, and those good christian Protestants called ‘Puritans,’ or ‘round heads’ [and] ‘prick-ears,’ walk. But shameless ruffians, past grace and good manners, with black-mouthed Tertullus, [Acts xxiv. 1] will be babbling, when the shame lieth in length of their own hair! Is it not ‘a shame’ for a man to wear ‘long hair?’ If they will not believe me, they may St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 14. . . This sect . . endeavours, according to St. Peter’s rule, to live, first, soberly, in respect of themselves; and so are no drunkards, or at least no common ones, if they fall: . . secondly, they live uprightly, in respect of their christian brethren, using fair and honest dealing between man and man. If there be a close hypocrite amongst them, as Judas amongst the apostles, . . let us not condemn all for some, a generality for a particularity. Thirdly, they live holily towards God; and it excellently appeareth in their frequent receiving of the sacra-

dues, . . honour to whom honour,"^a it is incumbent upon us especially that we should assist to perpetuate the memory of one of those servants of Christ, whom the hands of friendship and love have embalmed thus precious: "This year, 1643, about the 18th day of April, died Mr. William Brewster, the ruling-elder of the Church of Christ at Plymouth [New England];^b concerning whom I could say much of my own knowledge, but I shall content myself only to insert the honourable testimony that Mr. William Bradford [sen.] deceased, hath left. . . 'My dear friend, Mr. W. Brewster, was a man that had done and suffered much for the Lord Jesus and the Gospel's sake; and hath borne his part, in weal and woe, with this poor persecuted church above thirty-six years, in England, Holland, and in the Wilderness; and done the Lord and them faithful service in his place and calling. And notwithstanding the many troubles and sorrows he passed through, the Lord upheld him to a great age: 84. He had this blessing added by the Lord to all the rest, to die in his bed in peace, among his friends, who mourned and wept over him, and ministered what help and comfort they could unto him, and he again recompensed them while he could. . . I would now demand of any, What he was the worse, for former sufferings? What do I say, worse! no, he was better, and they now add to his honour.'^c But though he wanted the riches and pleasures of the world, in this life, and pompous monuments of his funeral; yet the memorial of the just shall be blessed, when the name of the wicked shall rot,^d with all their marble monuments!

"He was well educated in learning; as at inferior schools, so also at the University; and from thence went to the Court, and there served Mr. Davison, a godly gentleman and Secretary of State to Queen Elizabeth; and attended him on his embassage to Holland, and was employed by him in matters of greatest trust, as in keeping the keys of the Cautionary-towns delivered up to him for her Majesty, and things of the like nature. This master would always, in private, confer with him as a friend or equal. He afterwards lived in good esteem in his own country, and did much good until the troubles of those times enforced his remove into Holland, and since to New England; and was, in both places, of singular use and benefit to the church and people of

ment, and in having a reverent regard of the name of God, not daring to take it in vain, much less to curse, swear, or blaspheme that holy Name by which they 'are sealed to the day of redemption,' Eph. iv. 30. Besides, the Sunday, most properly named the Sabbath-day or Lord's-day, they celebrate not in luxury or wantonness, not in riot or excess; not in hobbyhorsing, morrisdancing, carding, dicing, bowling, wrestling, tippling, sporting, gaming; or unnecessary idling or vain spending that day or the evening thereof, in unnecessary walking to take the air, and so forth: but in sanctifying that day as the Lord requireth, and as is prescribed in the *Practice of Piety*, a book we allow good, and made by the Spirit of God; which tells us that if we do not sanctify that day, and every part thereof, we shall never keep a Sabbath with the Lord in heaven. Methinks, when we consider our neglects in this duty, we should tremble to punish these good and godly people by *Courting*, or imprisoning them!.. P. 1—3. In 1643 was printed "One Argument more Against the CAVALIERS: taken from their Violation of Churches, etc. Printed in the year when Men think what they list, and speak and write what they think." 4to. pp. 20.

^a Rom. xiii. 7.

^b See back, vol. i. p. 391.

^c 2 Thess. i. 5—7; 1 Pet. iv. 14.

^d Prov. x. 7.

Plymouth, whereof he was ; being eminently qualified for such work as the Lord had appointed him unto, of which, should I speak particularly as I might, I should prove tedious. I shall content myself, therefore, only to have made honourable mention in general of so worthy a man." ^a

CHAP. XLIV.

CONTROVERSY, BY HERLE ; R. MATHER AND W. THOMPSON ;
RUTHERFURD ; MATHER.

THE order of time has brought us to "The Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches ; Wherein the Question of Independency of Church Government is temperately, first, Stated ; secondly, Argued ; thirdly, Cleared from the Objections ; and fourthly, Appealed in, to the Judgments of such as stand for it.—By Master Herle, a Lancashire Minister ; at the Request and for the Satisfaction of some Friends of his, and by them published.—Lond. 1643." 4to. pp. 44.

It does not appear who were the parties making this request ; but the author, in his prefatory epistle, addresses them thus : "Gentlemen, In answer, if not satisfaction of your desires, I send you the enclosed, wherein, as I have argued against the tenet, so have I appealed to the judgment of those of the Independent opinion, whom you profess, and not unworthily, so much to reverence." And his candour is, afterward, expressed in these words, "For the difference between us and our brethren that are for Independency, it is nothing so great as you seemed to conceive it ; we do but, with Abram and Lot, take several ways ; we are, as Abram speaks, 'brethren' still ; and, as they were, ready to rescue each other, on all occasions, against the common enemy." ^b Again, he writes, "Every difference in opinion is not a diversity of religion. Opinion is well called the spy of truth ; reason's projector ;

^a Morton's New-England's Memorial, 1669. p. 116.—In p. 77, Morton records, under the date 1629, "Mr. Skelton and Mr. Higginson arrived at Salem in June. Between the latter and Mr. Brewster a correspondence commenced concerning church-membership. They agreed, that 'Baptism was a seal of membership ; only when they were adult, they, being not scandalous, were to be examined by the church-officers, and upon their approbation of their fitness, and upon the children's public and personal owning of the [church] covenant, they were to be received unto the Lord's supper. Accordingly, Mr. Higginson's eldest son, being about fifteen years of age, was owned to have been received a member, together with his parents ; and being privately examined by the pastor, Mr. Skelton, about his knowledge in the principles of religion, he did present him before the church when the Lord's supper was to be administered, and the child then, publicly and personally, owning the Covenant of the God of his father, he was admitted unto the Lord's supper. It being then professedly owned, according to 1 Cor. vii. 14, that the 'children' of the church are 'holy' unto the Lord, as well as their parents ; accordingly, the parents, owning and retaining the baptism which they themselves received in their infancy in their native land, as they had any children born, baptism was administered unto them, namely, to the children of such as were members of that particular church."

^b Gen. xiii. 8 ; xiv. 16.

and while but modestly laid down as a problem of discourse,—not cried up for an article of faith; setting, so, the sun by the dial,—it is the ‘fan’ to ‘purge’ the religious ‘floor’ with ^a The Turk’s religion is never a whit the better that it never passed through this furnace, The strife of tongues: it is a sign the devil hath no such quarrel to it, nor God any such care of it, as by this kind of ventilation to make it take the faster root.”

The treatise opens with “The question stated;” and, after showing that papists’ make “four several kinds of visible churches:” the virtual, or the pope; the consistorial, the cardinals; the representative, a council; and, the essential, the whole number of professors: it is said the first two of these are, here rejected; all acknowledge the “essential;” but the “representative” is denied by the Independents. Hence, “co-ordinatively mutual dependency of churches in their government, is the thing in question.” ^b That is, “Whether it be necessary to the ‘well being’ of such a single church, or congregation, that where it stands in neighbourhood with other churches, especially under the same civil government, That it be equally and mutually co-ordinated with the rest in a dependence on the ministerial government of a synod or assembly of them all? This, they deny, and we affirm.” ^c

The points which Herle laid down for his discussion, are these four, The pattern of the Jewish church; The institution of our Saviour; The practice of his apostles; and, Other rules of Scripture.

His first argument he founds on Deut. xvii. 8—10; 2 Chron. xix. 8, 10, 11; and Psal. cxxii. 4, 5. As there was always something of “type,” he says, in the “ceremonial” laws proper to the Jewish church, and of “rule” in the “judicial” laws proper to that “State;” so, in both, there remains “somewhat of general equity, and moral concernment; obliging us and all now and always, as well as them then.” ^d And he infers, that “if the benefit of appeals, and consociation of churches, . . . should not be as free to us as to the Jews, how much more defective and improvident were the Gospel than the Law!” ^e From this he resorts to meet the objection, That these gradual forms of appeal are borrowed from heathenish customs. “It is easily answered,” he says: “Custom, in whomsoever, as it cannot by differing from it, prescribe against, so much less can it by agreeing with it, forfeit nature, or morality. In spiritual actions, wherein a natural and moral necessity of forms is implied, it is no heathenism to use such forms as have been used by Heathen; as in preaching, for one to speak at once; in prayer, to bend the knee. . . Hence is it, in all likelihood, that no more is written in Scripture of these kinds of dependencies and appeals in church government, because they are of natural light.” ^f What cogency there might appear to be in this mode of reasoning in the author’s own mind, we confess our inability to perceive any. “If,” he says afterward, “the papists urge the same texts, they do not urge the same arguments from them:” ^g neither can we. With no more force, as appears to us, Herle writes, “For that common objection, Where do we read in Scripture of a national church since this of the Jews? It is

^a Matt. iii. 12.^b R. 3.^c P. 4.^d P. 5.

P. 7.

^f 1 Thess. iv. 9. — P. 7.^g P. 8.

answered well enough," he says, "with a like question, Where, in Scripture, do we read of a nation converted to the faith, besides that of theirs? Wherever," he adds, "they show us such a nation, we will show them such a national church."^a

Herle's second argument is founded on Matt. xviii. 17, "Tell the church." Here he begs the question, where he reasons that "The remedy of complaint, or appeal, must be as large as the malady offence; otherwise Christ's salve were not equal to the sore: but offences may arise as well between divers congregations in the same [national] church, as between divers members in the same congregation."^b And into what difficulty he brought himself is plain, where he ventures on the assertion, "That an offence may be so general as to defile and make guilty a whole land, sufficiently appears in Scripture;^c and why not, then, the remedy as large as it? 'Tell the church.' Suppose the magistrate an enemy to religion; and the land, or whole *church* therein,—or, if that word sound not well, the whole number of believers,—have occasion to make a solemn renewal of their covenant with God; shall not this whole church, or number in their collective body, have power to enjoin it? How else is the remedy equal either to the offence or need?"^d If divines will persist in mixing the church with the world, and so make the world the church, they are only to be pitied for creating their own difficulties: so, however, did not our Saviour direct; otherwise it were a flat contradiction to his own testimony, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world;"^e whence, as God has "ordained" the "powers"^f which preside over the various States in the world, so the world is, and ever must be, till the consummation of all things, contradistinguished from the church in its elements and its government; benefited, indeed in degree, by the corrective properties of "the salt" wherewith it is salted.^g

Herle thought, however, doubtless, that he had reduced those of a contrary judgment, to a perceptible absurdity, in this succeeding paragraph, "That by the word 'church' here in this place, is principally meant the presbytery and eldership, will be easily evinced out of the text itself: thus, those, questionless, our Saviour means when he bids 'tell the church;' to whom he continues his words in that immediately ensuing promise of ratifying in heaven whatever they shall 'bind' or 'loose' on earth; assuring them that when 'two or three' of them shall be so 'gathered together,' he will be 'in the midst of them.'...^h If the whole congregation be the 'two or three' there mentioned,—as Independents would have it,—suppose of those 'two,' the one be the offending, the other the offended 'brother' whom the offender 'will not hear;' what 'church' shall he 'tell?' Where shall he find the 'two or three witnesses' to 'tell' first,—before he tell it to 'the church,'—in whose 'mouth' the matter may be first 'established?'ⁱ Shall the offended

^a P. 9.^b P. 10.^c Num. xxxv. 33; Hos. iv. 1; Jere. xxiii. 10.^d P. 11.^e John xvii. 14; xv. 19.^f Rom. xiii. 1.

^g Matt. v. 13.—"The moral doctrine of government, or the reasons why and how far it ought to be obeyed, is perfectly distinguished from the physical theory which explains how it is formed and changed." Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir James Mackintosh, 1836. 2nd Edit. 8vo. vol. i. p. 72.

^h Matt. xviii. 18, 20.ⁱ Ver. 15, 16.

party be the 'witnesses,' and 'church,' and judge, and all? How so? Is the apostle's rule observed, 'When ye are gathered together . . . to deliver such a one to Satan;' ^a must the *one* gather himself together to excommunicate the *other*? Or, because, until excommunicated, he is yet a 'brother,' must he join with the other in excommunicating himself?" ^b We ask, in return, by what authority the word "so" is interposed before the words "gathered together;" and whence is it that the "two or three" are necessarily, referred to "the presbytery and eldership" of this paragraph? Has it been a vain imagination, hitherto, that Christ has graciously promised to be "in the midst" of any and every "two or three" gathered together in his "Name," unless they were presbyters, or elders? And in the case supposed, that the "two" are "believers," it follows that when diversity of opinion arises, they will avail themselves of such helps as the matter shall require; but if no outward means present themselves, they can each seek by prayer that counsel and direction needful for the occasion, and if they still fail to be agreed or pacified, they must divide and walk each by the "light" that is in him. ^c

The following argument, or the third, is taken, Herle says, "from Acts, chap. xv." He now makes a stand upon the consent, or unanimity, of those whose separate systems are only upheld by being placed on the same foundation. "If" says he, "that all ancient and modern writers, of all sorts,—excepting only some few of these last fifty years, engaged by their own tenet of Independency,—have with one voice concluded this chapter a formal precedent for synods, would weigh anything herein, the matter would soon be at an end." ^d It is sufficient for us, to show that, in answer to the objection against this "occasional message" brought from Antioch being invested with the like circumstances imparted to transactions carried on between the high and mighty; "thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers;" ^e he is compelled to reason inconclusively on the subject, for thus he writes, "It neither follows, because the commissioners of the other churches are not named, therefore they were not there; nor because they were not there, therefore they ought not to have been." ^f And, again, he concludes, "It is more than probable" that the apostles "submitted it to this way, of purpose hereby to institute this synodal way of church government." ^g But setting all this aside, others besides "Independents" are, in our days at least, to be placed among the exceptions." ^h

After more than four pages employed in the fruitless attempt to swell into importance a very simple natural transaction, which only the theory of a national church makes compulsory on its advocates, we find ourselves arrived at the fourth argument, or that relating to "The laying on of hands of the presbytery." 1 Tim. iv. 14. As this subject partakes of similar qualities with that relating to synods, it holds, in our

^a 1 Cor. v. 4, 5.

^b P. 17.

^c Matt. vi. 22, 23.

^d P. 19.

^e Col. i. 16.

^f P. 20.

^g P. 21.

^h To call the coming together of the apostles and elders, in this chapter, a "synod" or "council," is, Mosheim says, "a manifest abuse of the word. That meeting was only of one church, and if such a meeting be called a council, it will follow that there were innumerable councils in the primitive times." Eccles. Hist. bk. i. chap. ii. sect. 14. and note, Maclaine's edit.

estimation, but the same comparative importance; and would never have been so much contested but for the assumed relation it bears to an external dominancy claimed exclusively by the ambitious, and practised upon the submissive and credulous. Beyond the simple admission of confraternity, we have yet to learn that there is any transmissive and delegated power competent, in these latter ages of the churches, to obtrude itself to confer and preserve the principle of vitality and continuity. Such a doctrine, if sound, would unchurch in reality all those christian communities which have existed in various parts of the world, but which were never instituted and confirmed by other than the promised communication of the Holy Spirit "to them that ask."^a That this gift is descendible only through the popish succession, is a profanation of it even to imagine. Holiness and sanctity are prostituted terms when applied to innumerable individuals in that pretended succession, so that it were blasphemy to assert that they had themselves ever received the Holy Spirit! It follows, that there is other provision for giving validity to the external matter of a Christian church. So much, then, for a "ministerial" in opposition to an "essential" institution of churches.

Herle endeavours to sustain his previous efforts by a further attempt to meet objections which "fall not within the replies upon the foregoing arguments." But as he does this by merely arguing *a simili in simile*, from the like to the like; from the integrity or entireness of a "single church" composed of members, to the integrity of "a synod," composed of churches; he makes no advance in his general argument.

After this, he quits his premises, and turns, in the concluding section, to entreaty, by appealing "to the judgments of the adverse Party." He tells his "Reverend and dear brethren,"—"I acknowledge and admire the excellency of those graces of learning, industry, piety, that shines in many, in most of you: however, give me leave in all humility and friendliness, to offer to your dis-pre-engaged judgments these seven considerations following, from the order, unity, peace, communion, strength, authority, and safety of government."^b These several categories Herle handles in a fanciful manner; as that "order is the sinew, the soul of Nature; unity, is the centre, and peace the circle of Nature; etc." The "end" of all, he says, is "safety;" the climax which he had prepared to enable him to append these words, "Now,—besides how much the civil State may in its 'safety' be endangered, by a multiplying and, as it were, retailing, entireness of church power into so many hands; which I leave to others whom it more concerns;—how much will this way of church-independency be sure to endanger itself? Every congregation throughout the land, suppose, consisting of 'a hundred and twenty' members apiece; the *maximum quod sic* of a congregation, as some conceive, from that of Acts i. 15;—will not be able to allow their pastor and other officers such maintenance as will countervail so large an expense of time and cost in study, but that for the most part they must enter young upon the ministry. . . . When every such single congregation so governed shall have entire and independent power of government, and liberty of doctrine, accountable in neither to Assemblies; how apt such young pastors will be, through want of experience,

^a Luke xi. 13.

^b P. 37.

to err, and, through those *juveniles calores*, those heats and headinesses incident to green-heads, to persist in that error, and their congregations with them; and thereupon, if the error be not generally received, to break and subdivide into pieces, and, in the end, into nothing!"^a Such is one of the hypotheses which were calculated, in those times to intimidate and alarm: the author of this, concentrates the object of his present efforts, in his final sentence, "Solomon tells us, that it is 'in the multitude of counsellors' that there is 'safety';"^b and experience tells us, that counsellors without any authority are but foils without point or edge, to be played with not trusted to, in case of 'safety' or defence."

Whatever diminished importance may now belong to the treatise we have just dismissed, and on which we had penned our remarks before having perused that which we are about to introduce; yet respect for its author, and the posture of public affairs, gave to Herle's treatise an interest, originally, in which we cannot fully participate. It crossed the Atlantic speedily, and a formal reply to it returned almost as speedily, under the title of "A Modest and Brotherly Answer to Mr. Charles Herle, his Book against the 'Independency of Churches.' Wherein his four Arguments for the Government of Synods over Particular Congregations are friendly examined, and clearly answered. Together with Christian and loving Animadversions upon sundry other observable Passages in the said Book. All tending to declare the true use of Synods, and the Power of Congregational Churches in the points of Electing and Ordaining their own Officers, and Censuring their Offenders.—By Richard Mather, Teacher of the Church at Dorchester; and William Thompson, Pastor of the Church at Braintree, in New England.—Sent from thence after the Assembly of Elders were dissolved that last met at Cambridge, to Debate matters about Church Government.—Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 58. It will be obvious that the date bears relation only to distance of place, not of time; which is our reason for putting this article in juxta-position with what occasioned it.

In this Epistle, they begin by alluding to the strenuous efforts then making to find out "the right form of Church government;" and by confessing themselves not to be exempt from the obligation to "try all things."^c Not being satisfied with Herle's book, they tell him that they publish "to show unto yourself and others what yet hinders us, that we do not think your 'Arguments' to be convincing." They might have manifested the more zeal in expediting their reply from the interest they had personally in "Lancashire," and especially in Herle's parish there, "Winwick, wherein one of us was born, and the other was, for sundry years together, an unworthy minister." They take the opportunity of testifying their "thankfulness for that loving respect which we found from you when we lived together in that country; when you were pleased to own us, in our sad times."

Among their remarks on Herle's first section, these respondents state that they will not yield that a Synod is a representative or collective "Church," unless "it could be found that in Scripture the name of a church is given to a synod;" but they concede the assembly in Acts xv.

^a P. 42.^b Prov. xi. 14.^c 1 Thess. v. 21.

to have been a synod: still they restrict the authority of such bodies to "being according to the Scripture" only.

They think that notwithstanding Matt. xviii. 20, a Church must consist of "so many as shall be necessary and requisite for the carrying on of church work, in admonition and reprehension, . . . and, therefore they had need be seven or more. . . . There are three, at least, that must be acquainted with the matter, before it must be brought unto the church; namely, the brother offending, the brother offended, and one witness at the least; so that [there must be] another number greater than they, and distinct from them, to whom the matter is brought in the last place."

"For excommunication, ordination, and censures, there is nothing in Scripture, nor proved in this discourse of yours, that these matters belong only to a synod, and not to a particular congregation. Yea, we conceive it will not be easy for any man whatsoever to prove that synods, and they only, have power to ordain officers and to excommunicate offenders: and till this be proved, the 'Independents,' as you call them, need not to relinquish their judgment and practice in these particulars. Sure it is, that synod in Acts xv. did neither meddle with admonition nor excommunication."

There is much weight in their remarks on Herle's concession, where he acknowledges "That where there is no consociation or neighbourhood of congregations, or single churches, whereby they may, with conveniency, be aiding to each other," and, "whereto the particulars may have recourse, . . . there, a single congregation must not be denied entireness of jurisdiction."^a They say, "We suppose a man may improve this grant of yours to a confirmation of that 'Independency of churches' which you plead against; and to a disproving of a good part of that authority of synods which you would establish. For, if a church that hath 'no neighbourhood' of other churches have power of 'jurisdiction' entirely within itself, . . . then, First, let it be considered whence such a church hath such power; and see if that ground will not reach to prove the like power in other churches also. Now we suppose," they continue, "none will deny but such a church hath this authority or power by the gift of Christ, and the liberty which he hath granted to every church, as it is a church; which we had rather express in Dr. Ames' words than in our own. 'The power itself,' namely, in reproving scandals, and purging out the wicked, 'of right, or in respect of the first act, cannot be separated from a true church; because it flows immediately and necessarily from its very essence: for it is contained in that covenant whereby believers are gathered into a church.'^b Now if this be so, . . . then it will follow, that this 'power' must not be granted to be in such a church as hath no neighbour churches, and be denied unto one that hath: because a church that hath neighbours is a church, and hath the essence of a church, as truly as that which hath none. . . .

"Secondly, let it be considered also, What is the end and use of the 'consociation' and 'neighbourhood of churches;' and the same truth will thence appear also: . . . it may be helpful by casting in more

^a Herle, p. 2.

^b "Conscience, with the Power and Cases thereof." Bk. iv. chap. 24. q. 4. s. 17.

light; but cannot abridge them of any 'power' which they had before. When Dr. Ames had said that the 'combination' of churches 'into classes and synods' doth 'neither constitute a new form of the church, nor ought, by any means, to take away or impair that liberty and power which Christ hath left unto his Churches, since it serveth only for the directing and furthering of the same;' ^a what saith Mr. Paget hereunto? 'This,' saith he, 'we willingly grant.'^b Now, if this must be granted, then, that dependency of churches, and that power of synods, which you plead for, must not be granted! For, let a church have 'entireness of jurisdiction' before she have any neighbouring churches, and be deprived of the power when God sends such neighbours; and by this means she sustains loss by having neighbours; she comes to be, in this respect, in worse condition than when she had none: which is against the true intent and use of the 'consociation' of churches."

To Herle's statement that the Independents say church government ministerial is equally, and fully, in every single congregation; "above or besides which, there is no ministerially governing church, by any means,—they say,—to be admitted;" ^c this answer is furnished, "If the Presbyters of a congregation may be called 'a church,' then, since they do admit the 'governing power' of the Presbytery, they do admit a 'governing church,' besides the congregation; if by congregation you mean the whole multitude of the members. And, if a synod may be called 'a church;' and if 'power' by disputation and disquisition to clear up the rule, and then to command obedience thereto, may be called 'government,' then, they also admit a synod to be a 'governing church:' for the 'power' here mentioned they do allow unto synods. But it seems to us that the 'power' is not properly a power and exercise of government and jurisdiction, but a power of Doctrine; and so a synod is rather a teaching than a governing church. But that any other church, be it synod or any other besides the congregation and its Presbytery, should have such a 'governing power' above the congregation and the presbytery thereof, as that neither the congregation nor its presbytery may ordain their own officers, nor excommunicate their own offenders, but both must be done by that other 'governing church;' this, we do not admit indeed; because, hitherto, we have seen no convincing proofs for the same"... "You know there are divers sorts of synods; some particular, which are called Classes; some Provincial; some National; and some General, or Oecumenical synods. And we should be glad to know which of all these it is in whom the ultimate 'power' of these things doth reside; and, why it may not reside in any of the rest; yea, and why the ultimate 'power' of censures may not reside in the congregation, as well as in any of them?"

On the second Argument of Herle it is replied, "Though it were granted, that when our Saviour saith 'Tell the church,' he means, Tell the Elders; and though it were granted also, that enjoining such a gradual proceeding, he prescribeth no new rule; but the same that had been given before unto the Jews; yet neither of these do prove that congregations must depend upon the authority of synods: and the reason

^a "The Marrow of Sacred Divinity." Bk. 1. chap. 39. sect. 27.

^b Defence, p. 107.

^c Herle, p. 3.

is, because both these may be performed in a particular congregation; for therein, a man may proceed by such steps and degrees as our Saviour enjoineeth; and may also, tell his matter to the elders of that particular church."

"Congregations must depend upon the government of synods! Yes, say you, because the remedy 'must be as large as the malady;' and 'otherwise, Christ's salve were not equal to the sore.' But if this reason be sufficient against the 'Independency of churches,' then, by the like reason, a man may prove that the church of a Nation must not be independent either. For... offences may arise between divers national churches... What if the national church offend the church of another nation? Would you now say, that all these offences must fall within our Saviour's rule of Telling the church; and, that this were a sufficient reason against the independency of national churches and national synods?... Of necessity, for aught we can discern, you must own the reason as strong in both cases; or else refuse it as weak in both!... Whole churches are subject to the wholesome advice and counsel of other churches; and so far as the same shall be according to God, they ought to hearken thereunto: and if they do not, they may lawfully be renounced by other churches from all church communion with them."

Herle having said, "No other place can be showed wherein our Saviour used the word 'church' for a single congregation;"^a it is replied by these Answerers, "Nor that he ever used the word at all but only here and in Matt. xvi. 18, 'Upon this rock I will build my church;' in which place he means a synod no more than a single congregation."

From their reply to Herle's third Argument, we extract as follows. Referring to Acts xv., "The matter determined, was a matter of Doctrine; namely, whether 'circumcision' was necessary to salvation; and, therefore, [it was] no matter of Jurisdiction, unless jurisdiction and doctrine be the same." And where Herle writes, "This 'decree' is itself a Rule given, wherein and whereby to use the Keys upon such as shall prove stubborn:... and, that authority which can give the Rule, can, *a fortiori*, back, and punish its breach:"^b they ask, "But is this certain and clear?... We propose to consideration these instances for the contrary: First,... Isaiah, Joel, Amos, and the rest,... not being Priests themselves, nor Levites, they had not authority to punish, by way of Discipline, such as disobeyed their Doctrine, and those holy Rules which they delivered from the Lord. Next, any one minister who is truly sent of God, may in his Doctrine, deliver the Rules of God's Word,... and yet one minister alone cannot punish the breach of those Rules... Further, Any minister, or ministers, of one church, be it congregational or national, may, upon occasion, being desired thereto, preach the Word of God in another the like church, and so impose burdens of christians' duties to be observed by them;... yet it would not follow, they might, by Discipline, punish such as should walk contrary to those Rules... We suppose it is clear, that some men may have authority, by way of Doctrine, to impose Rules that must be observed

^a Herle, p. 12.

^b *Ib.* p. 25.

as ‘necessary things ;’^a and yet not have authority, by way of Discipline, to punish those that shall disobey those Rules. And, therefore, though the first of these were granted to be within the power of a synod, yet that they have power to do the other also, is not proved thereby.”

Under the fourth Argument of Herle, and upon his having asked, “Where, in all the Scriptures, do we read of any ordination of pastors but by presbyters ?”^b answer is made in three things, “First, That we do read of such a matter in the Scripture: secondly, that if we did not, yet we read so much as by good consequence doth infer the lawfulness of the practice: thirdly, That which we do read, that may seem to make against this practice, is not because the thing is, in every case, unlawful; but for other reasons. For the first of these, we allege Numbers viii. 10. Which place sheweth that though the Levites were church officers and the children of Israel were none, yet the children of Israel did ‘lay their hands upon the Levites.’ By which Scripture thus much is manifest, That when a church hath no Elders, but the first Elders themselves are to be ordained, and this, at such times and in such places where Elders cannot conveniently be borrowed from any other church, in such case imposition of hands may lawfully be performed by some principal men of the Congregation, although they be not Elders by office; for, since it was so in the church of Israel, as this text doth witness, what should hinder but, in the like case, the like may be lawfully done in these days? If any shall ask how was it possible that the children of Israel, being six hundred thousand, should all lay hands upon the Levites at once? It is not likely that ‘all’ did it, but some, instead of the rest. And so, when some do impose hands instead of all the congregation, that may be sufficient.” Granting that these children of Israel were Elders, “If they did it as Elders, then either as Elders and governors ecclesiastical, or as civil governors: but not the first, for that charge was only belonging to Aaron and his sons, and these Levites now ordained: ^c if the second be said, then it will follow that civil magistrates, though no church officers, may impose hands in ordination of church officers; and so the point is gained, for if magistrates may do it, then it will follow, that a church, wanting magistrates, may perform this action by other the fittest instruments she hath.”

“Now that imposition of hands cannot always be performed by officers three instances make it manifest: First, When there are no officers of any other church to be had, as at the first rise of the first Christian church in a pagan country far remote from all churches; as here, in America, by the English; and in the case which you put, of a company of Christians by shipwreck cast upon an island where no pastors were. Secondly, when those that may be had are so exceedingly corrupt, and the churches to which they do belong, that it could not be convenient to make use of them, but very dangerous to fetch ordination only from them; as at the first Reformation after the times of popery, when there were none to be had but from the popish bishops and priests, from whom to receive ordination were as much as to say either that the ministers of Antichrist may ordain ministers to the church of Christ; or else, that popish bishops are true ministers of Christ!... Thirdly, When

^a Acts xv. 28.

^b Herle, p. 26.

^c Levit. viii.

those that are more desirable have no sufficient calling to dispense ordination in another church; which is the case when they are not requested thereto: for since ordinary Elders are not like apostles, to feed all flocks, but that 'flock of God' which dependeth upon them;^a that 'flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them 'overseers';^b therefore, we do not understand how they can assume authority and power unto themselves to ordain Elders to other churches whereof themselves are neither elders nor members, unless they had a calling thereto by the request of that church where the elders are to be ordained. . . Therefore, in such cases as these, since officers must not be admitted without imposition of hands, imposition of hands must be performed by non-officers. . . We do willingly grant, that where a church is furnished with Elders imposition of hands is to be performed by the Elders; and so much the examples in the New Testament do evince."

"This assembling of Elders unto a classis, or synod, doth imply that there were Elders before there was any classis, or synod; and if so, then certainly, there was no concurrence of the classis, or synod, in the ordination of those Elders, since they were Elders before that synod had any being: which doth sufficiently show that the concurrence of a synod is not always required in the ordaining of Elders."

On the choice of Ministers, the Answerers say, "If Ministers must not be chosen by the church, then, either they must be called of God immediately; or [they must be] Ministers without any calling at all; or be chosen and appointed by some other men. But not the first, because such immediate calling is now ceased: . . . nor the second, because that is expressly against the Scripture which saith 'No man must take this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as Aaron:'^c and, therefore, they that 'ran' when God sent them not, are many times, and very sharply, reprov'd in the Prophets:^d nor the third, for God hath not given any such authority to other men that are not of the church, to appoint officers to the church; nor may some of the church arrogate this power only to themselves, excluding the rest; because that which concerneth all, as this matter doth, ought to have approbation of all, unless it might appear that God had committed the thing only to some, which for the choosing of officers cannot be said."

"Inasmuch as our intentions were chiefly to consider the weight of your 'Arguments,' but not to undertake the defence of every objection which you purpose; and, considering withal that those 'considerations' from the order, unity, peace, and strength of government, with the rest, are not intended by you, as we suppose, as convincing, but only as probable, grounds against that way which you deal against; therefore, for these and some other reasons, having spoken to that which we conceive to be the main substance of your book, we will, for this time, surcease."

It does not appear that Herle encountered these his former acquaintance, personally; that task should rather seem to have been devolved on a more noted disputant, who produced in 1644, 4to "The due Right of Presbyteries: Or, a Peaceable Plea for the government of the

^a 1 Pet. v. 2.

^b Acts xx. 28.

^c Heb. v. 4.

^d Jer. xxiii. 21.

Church of Scotland. By Samuel Rutherford. — Lond." ^a This author, it is true, took occasion only to introduce incidentally, in the progress of his discourse, strictures on certain points in the "Answer" to Herle; that circumstance restricts our notice of Rutherford, here, to the replication which his strictures provoked from one of the authors of the "Answer," intituled "A Reply to Mr. Rutherford: Or, a Defence of the Answer to Mr. Herle. — By Richard Mather. — Lond. 1647." 4to. pp. 109. As nothing arises to affect, even by way of illustration, any other matters than the mere argumentation, the date of publication need not prevent the placing of this tract in contiguity with its precursors.

Mather writes in the Preface, dated Dec. 1646, "It is true which our reverend brother saith, in his Epistle to the Reader before his Peaceable Plea, 'That there is great cause of sorrow that all the Lord's people should not mind one thing, and sing one song, and join in one against the children of Babel.' Nevertheless, this may be some comfort against this sorrow, That by the Providence of the Lord, this diversity of opinions and disputes, if it be Christianly carried, as it may, may occasion and produce, in the issue, the further clearing up of truth. For, as our author well observeth, 'From the collision of opinions resulteth truth; and disputes, as stricken flints, cast fire for light.'" ^b He accounts for the apparent delay of his Reply, by referring to the remoteness of his residence ^c from this country; "in which respect, many things may be spoken and printed against us, whereto it cannot be expected that we should return a speedy answer."

We learn from the proem, that Rutherford had cited the joint "Answer" in "twenty-four, or twenty-five several places," ^d which, "if they be indeed erroneous and unsound, are a great many .. in so small a

^a He had, previously, sent forth "A Peaceable and Temperate Plea for Paul's Presbytery in Scotland: Or, A modest and Brotherly Dispute of the Government of the Church of Scotland. Wherein our Discipline is demonstrated to be the true apostolic Way of Divine Truth, and the Arguments on the contrary are friendly dissolved; the Grounds of Separation and the Independency of Particular Congregations, in defence of Ecclesiastical Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies, are examined and tried. By Samuel Rutherford, Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews. — Psal. xlviii. 12, 13. — London. 1642." 4to. pp. 316.

We find it asserted, in the Epistle to the Earl of Lindsey, that "The pens of the worthy Reformers.. have cleared the Scripture way of the government of Christ's Kingdom to lie in a mid-line between the Pope's and Prelates' lawless church-monarchy and the in disorderly confusion of democracy." And there also the writer's implacability is betrayed: "What daring insolency is this? When the Prelate could not find his father, and thought shame of his native father 'Diotrephes,' that one Dr. Hall and others have put him in the line of the blood-royal, and pointed him an office 'jure Divino, by Divine right?' Their predecessors were content of [with] the good old 'jus humanum.'" The next Epistle commences with this passage, "I am bold, reverend and Christian Reader, to appear in print to contribute my weak judgment for the Government of the Church of Scotland. In which suit I have to do with foes and friends." The body of the work consists of twenty chapters, eighteen being headed with a proposition in the form of a query. We have endeavoured, but in vain, to set out intelligibly the plan of this piece, or even to select a striking portion of the contents; so scholastic and little discursive is its construction. The title shows his design, and the spirit displayed by the writer accords to it with but few exceptions.

^b "Due Right, Ep."

^c Dorchester, in New England.

^d "Page 315, is the first place wherein I find him meddling with the 'Answer.'" N

work." He submits, therefore, "Whether the same do not still remain agreeable to the rule of truth," notwithstanding these objections.

Under his first chapter, we have this specimen of Mather's manner of meeting his opponent: "But saith he, 'The true cause,' namely, of appealing to higher courts, 'is, because they do not so frequently err: they are not so inclined to err; for many eyes see more than one, and do more seldom miscarry in taking up the right object: and because we conceive more equality and less partiality in higher courts.'... Let us consider what force there is in this to take away 'entireness of jurisdiction' from a congregation, and to establish the necessity of 'appealing.'... The thing I doubt of is this, Whether a congregational church of saints, furnished with a faithful presbytery, for of such only do I speak, may not, by virtue of this promise, Matt. xviii. 20, be as frequently preserved from error as those greater assemblies, ... it being supposed that the synods and councils did as frequently come together as the congregation doth. For, otherwise, I grant the synods meeting 'more seldom' may err 'more seldom:' but let the comparison be equal ... and then I doubt whether synods be preserved from error any oftener... It is well known what Nazianzen said of synods and councils in his time; namely, 'That he had never seen good and happy end of any of them;' and, 'That evils were not so much redressed as increased thereby.'...^a Seldomness of erring lying in the multitude ... of 'eyes' in such assemblies; it must follow thereupon, that universal or general councils, as having in them the most 'eyes,' are the assemblies that do most seldom 'err,' and so, unto them there must be most appeals! which, if it be granted, the classical, provincial, and national synods, are all, by this means, deprived and stript of 'entireness of jurisdiction:' ... and so there must be no 'entireness of jurisdiction' but only in the general councils!... Our brethren, by this means, have spun a fine thread, drawing forth a conclusion which is every whit as prejudicial to their own cause as to ours... But we think Christ Jesus hath provided better for his church than so; and hath not appointed such a necessity of appeals upon appeals, but that causes may be determined afore any general council can be assembled."

Mather contends, in his second chapter, for the power to "command" in synods, as well as to give advice; that is, "if a synod may be called 'a church.' " And he concludes, in his third chapter, with this opponent, "First, That there is no necessity that synods should excommunicate any, but only command the 'churches' to do their duty therein: secondly, in particular concerning that synod, Acts xv., That they were to remit the censure of excommunication to the presbyteries of Antioch and Jerusalem, in case of the obstinacy of these obtruders of 'circumcision.' Which particulars being most true, as I for the most part esteem them, it follows thereupon that what Master Rutherford saith in this place ... is greatly weakened thereby. For how both these can stand together, That this synod should have power not only to rebuke but to excommunicate these false teachers, and yet neither provincial, national, nor oecumenical synods to excommunicate any; nor this synod in particular, to excommunicate these false teachers, but to

^a Ad Procopium, ep. xlii.

remit the censure to other churches to whom it concerned, commanding them to do ;—how these things, I say, can stand together, I for my part, am not able to understand.”

“It is plain from verse the second,” he continues, in his third chapter, “that Antioch did endeavour to have ended that controversy amongst themselves, so far as they were troubled therewith. For, some, teaching that corrupt doctrine amongst them, they had much ‘disputation’ about the point afore they determined to send out for help elsewhere. Now, to what end was thus much ‘disputation’ if they had no right to determine the matter? . . . Since we do not find them in the least reproved by the Holy Ghost for this attempt, therefore we cannot but think they did well therein. And thereupon it followeth, that if Antioch was a ‘congregational church,’ as it seems from Acts xiv. 27, either this controversy did trouble no church but Antioch only, or else, when a controversy, or corrupt opinion, doth trouble many churches, one of them may lawfully determine and end it so far as concerns themselves.”

The fifth chapter reverts to Acts xv., and inquires “Whether their rebuking the false teachers do prove a power of jurisdiction and excommunication in synods : and, Whether preaching do prove the assembly where it is, to be a church?” On the former division Mather writes, “I suppose it will not be denied but [that] one congregation, if need so require, may rebuke and reprove another congregation, though neither of them be superior to other, but both of them equal and independent of each other in regard of subjection. Mr. Rutherford confesseth ‘That congregations and churches may admonish and rebuke each other :’ and sure it is, that Scripture, Cant. viii. 8, ‘We have a little sister, what shall we do for her?’ doth show that churches ought to care one for the good of another. And if they must take care and consult for one another, there is the like reason that they should reprove and admonish one another as need shall require. . . . But can any man infer hence, That the church thus rebuking another church hath power to excommunicate that other church? . . . And if this may not be affirmed, I do not see how rebuking performed by many, even by a whole synod, can be any sufficient ground to prove that the synod hath power to excommunicate.” On the latter division ; in order that ‘the apostles and elders’ might seem to be invested here with all the authority and power which some have endeavoured to confer upon them, Rutherford had said, they ‘are not considered here, as merely preachers and teachers in the act of teaching ; for why then should they not be formally a church assembly, if they be an assembly meeting for preaching the Word?’ Mather writes, “Though we think here was a church, and a church assembly, we do not think Mr. Rutherford’s reason doth prove them so to be. For Paul and Silas were preachers of the Word in the prison at Philippi ; and at Mars’ hill ; and the market-place.^a And yet we think it hard to infer thence that those assemblies were ‘formally’ churches.”

From the sixth chapter, where is discussed “Whether the power of synods be a power of jurisdiction : and, Of the dependence of the syna-

^a Acts xvi. 32 ; xvii. 17, 22.

gogues upon the synedrion at Jerusalem ;” we gather that “ It doth not follow that our congregations shall therefore be dependent, as were the Jewish synagogues, except it were also proved that they must depend upon synods in point of jurisdiction and discipline, as well as in point of doctrine ; yea, and so depend as that the sentence of those synods must be obeyed under pain of death.^a Sure the synagogues, and every member of them, were in this sort dependent upon the supreme synedrion ; but we hope our Reverend Brother will not say that congregations must, in this sense, be dependent upon synods ; at the leastwise, this, we hope he will not deny, that every member of a church is bound to depend upon the pastor of that church in point of doctrine : and yet it will not follow that he must depend upon one pastor alone in point of jurisdiction and discipline. And the reason is, because doctrine may be dispensed by one pastor alone, but discipline must be dispensed by a church, which one pastor alone cannot be. And therefore, if congregations were to be dependent upon synods in point of doctrine, it would not follow that they must be dependent in point of jurisdiction and discipline.”

Passing to the seventh chapter, “ Whether the lawfulness or necessity of appeals do prove a superiority of jurisdiction in synods over congregations ;” here Mather asks for proof that if appeals be lawful, that then there is a supremacy of synods over congregations. “ I conceive,” he says, “ it is not proved hereby at all ; but, contrarily, appeals may be granted ‘lawful’ when there is just reason and ground for them ; and yet the ‘supremacy of synods over congregations is still uncleared. It still remains a question, who must be the judge of the reasonableness of the appeal, and of those cases that are put to show when they are reasonable, namely, That the matter belongs not to the congregation and the rest that are named ? And unless it be cleared to whom it belongs to judge these things, we are still left at uncertainty in the main matter, namely, In whom the ‘supremacy’ doth lie, from whom we may not appeal ? . . . And therefore, what we said in the ‘Answer’ doth still, for aught I see, remain sound, ‘That there must be some final and supreme judgment, that controversies may not, by appeals after appeals, be spun out *in infinitum* ; and to determine where that supremacy doth lie is the main question, which, unless it be determined, the usefulness of appeals may be granted, and yet we shall be still at uncertainty about the thing in question, and as much to seek as before ; because that there ought to be appeals till you come to the highest, is one thing, and that a synod and not the congregation is the highest, is another.’^b Now, whether our Brother, in that which we have hitherto heard, have sufficiently cleared it unto us, that we may know where this ‘supremacy’ doth lie, I leave it to the judicious to consider.”

The subject of the eighth chapter is, “ Whether Antioch, Acts xv., had right to have ended the controversy amongst themselves if they had been able, etc.” From the second verse it is plain, Mather says, “ that Antioch did endeavour to have ended the matter ‘amongst themselves.’ . . . Now this endeavour doth argue their right ; for otherwise it had been

^a Deut. xvii. 11, 12.

^b “Answer, p. 13, 14,” of which the above is Mather’s own summary.

sinful, as being a presuming to do that which did not belong to them. . . Therefore . . . Antioch was not dependent upon the jurisdiction of other churches, but had independent power within themselves ; as many may have who yet need the help of light from others for their direction in using their power."

Under the ninth chapter, "Whether the congregational way, or the presbyterial, do make the Gospel more difficultive than the Law: Of excommunication by a church that hath only three Elders: and, Of doing things suddenly;" Mather remarks, that "rational and judicious readers" may better judge of what he and his colleague had written in their "Answer,"^a he has "here re-collected the same into this short sum, . . . namely, If the Jews had a supreme judicatory for the final ending of causes, and 'the congregational way' hath the like: if the Jews had a standing judicatory always in readiness for the hearing of causes, and 'the congregational way' hath the like: and, if the supreme judicatory among the Jews was very far remote from many of them; and in 'the congregational way,' be more convenient, and near at hand; then, 'the congregational way' is, in some things, equal to the Jews', and in other things more excellent." Upon "the presbyterial way," Mather retorts thus, "If the Jews had a supreme judicatory for the final ending of causes, and the 'way' of our Brethren hath not: if the Jews had a standing judicatory always in readiness for the hearing of causes, and the 'way' of our Brethren hath not: and, if the supreme judicatory among the Jews was very remote from many of them, and synods among our Brethren are the same; then, the 'way' of our Brethren is, in some things, as defective as the Jews', and in other things more defective than theirs." He continues, "Having thus reduced our argumentation to its own proper and genuine shape, let us now consider of Mr. Rutherford's answer thereto. Saith he, 'The speediness of ending controversies in a congregation is badly comprised with the suddenness and temerity of delivering men to Satan upon the decision of three Elders, without so much as asking advice of any classis of Elders; and with deciding questions deep and grave, which concerneth many churches; which is putting of a private sickle in a common and public harvest.' If," replies Mather, "advice from other churches may be had, we never spake word for doing weighty matters without the same; but, in such cases, it is both our practice and advice, to make use thereof: and, therefore, this 'delivering men to Satan' in way of 'temerity' or rashness toucheth not us. . . As for 'suddenness,' I conceive if the same be sometimes accompanied with temerity and rashness, and so worthy of blame,—yet not always: for in the Reformation of the House of God in the days of Hezekiah, it is said that 'the thing was done suddenly,'^b where suddenness doth not signify any sinful 'temerity' or rashness; but, contrarily, doth testify God's great goodness that had so prepared the people to so good a work. . . Though hasty delivering of men to Satan, without due consideration, be not good; yet over-long delay of due proceeding against delinquents is bad also; for the Holy Ghost tells us, 'because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is

^a P. 17, 18.^b 2 Chron. xxix. 36.

fully set to do evil :’^a for which cause, ‘execute judgment in the morning,’^b that is to say, speedily, is sometimes expressly required. Which being spoken of justice to be executed by civil authorities, doth hold, by proportion and like reason, in ecclesiastical censures. . .—Whereas our Author thinks much that excommunication should proceed upon the decision of ‘three Elders,’ as we know nothing but [that] a congregation may have more Elders than ‘three,’ if God provide them fit men, and the numerousness of the congregation so require; in which case our Author saith nothing to the contrary but [that] they may have power to excommunicate; so, if they have but ‘three,’ we know nothing in this, but [that] they may have power to excommunicate, notwithstanding. . . He tells us that the ‘inferior judicatures in Israel had power of life and death :’^c for aught that doth appear, if three judges had power of life and death, why may not a congregation with ‘three Elders’ have power of excommunication? . . . Yea, he saith that ‘this is a principle of church policy, That every politic body of Christ hath power of church government within itself :’^d either, therefore, a congregation with only ‘three Elders’ is no politic body of Christ, or else it must have power of church government within itself! Lastly, his words are express, ‘Where there are not many churches consociated, then ordination and excommunication may be done by one single congregation.’^e If, therefore, a congregation have not above ‘three Elders,’ yet being not consociated with other churches, it may lawfully excommunicate, by his own grant. For deciding questions that concern many churches, if they decide them no further but only as they concern themselves; this is no ‘putting a private sickle in a common and public harvest,’ but a meddling with matters only so far as they do concern themselves. He saith ‘matters concerning many churches must be handled by many :’ this may be granted in a safe sense without any prejudice at all unto our cause; for we are well content, that so far as they concern ‘many,’ they may ‘be handled by many,’ so that each congregation may have liberty to deal in them so far as they concern themselves.”

The tenth chapter inquires “Whether the necessity of discipline be greater than of sacraments : and, Whether a congregation that hath neighbours may not exercise entireness of jurisdiction as well as one that hath none : and, Whether a man may take on him the whole ministry, having no outward calling thereto ; and may not as well take on him one act of baptizing ; or, ministering the Lord’s supper ?” Under this complex head, Mather asks, “Doth the accession of ‘neighbours’ to a congregation take away from such a congregation the essence of a church which it had before? . . . A family having the ‘essence’ of a family now it is alone, doth not lose this essence by means of other families added ; nor doth a city that is such as it is alone, lose the ‘essence’ of a city by the access of other cities ; and the same may be said of a corporation, a province, a kingdom, or any other society. . . That there should be such power in a congregation as in a master of a family over his children, needs a good deal of proof afore it may be

^a Eccles. viii. 11.^b Jere. xxi. 12.^c P. 315.^d P. 302.^e P. 338.

yielded, inasmuch as the power of the one is plainly and plentifully taught in the Scripture.^a But I desire one clear place of Scripture . . . to show the like power in a congregational church over the members of other churches ! . . . Of the greater necessity of discipline than of sacraments, his words are these, 'There is no such moral necessity of sacraments as there is of the ministry of the Word ; and, consequently, of the use of the Keys, where a scandalous person may infect the Lord's flock. For where 'vision' ceaseth, 'the people perish :'^b but it is never said where baptism ceaseth 'the people perish !'^c How shall we be sure that by 'vision' is meant discipline ? . . . The latter branch of the verse, 'he that keepeth the law, is blessed,' doth show that by 'vision' in the former branch is meant the law or doctrine, or Word of God. . . . Neither doth the Scripture say where administration of censures ceaseth 'the people perish ;' and therefore no necessity of censures above sacraments can be concluded hence."

Proceeding to the eleventh chapter, the subjects change to "Whether the power of jurisdiction, flowing immediately from the essence of a church, do not agree to a church that hath neighbours as well as to a church that hath none : and, Whether otherwise, neighbouring churches be not a loss : and, Whether pretence of mal-administration be a sufficient reason for neighbouring churches to deprive a congregation of its power." Here we must limit ourselves to this portion only of Mather's reply, "This indeed is most true, and must be so acknowledged, That though the Lord Almighty have given a power unto societies, whether they be families, commonwealths, or churches ; and have made sundry of them subordinate to none other the like societies, in the exercise of their power, but to have supremacy of power within themselves ; yet he hath also given them just and holy rules in his Word for the directing of them in the use of this power ; from which rules it is not lawful for them to swerve ; but if they do, it will be sin unto them, and he will surely require it of them. But now, between these two—the power itself, and the abuse or right use of the power,—we must carefully distinguish ; for though the abuse of their power be not given of God, from whom comes nothing but good, yet the power itself being good is given of him, and is so to be acknowledged. And, though abuse of their power do justly deserve at his hands that they should be deprived of the power itself, yet God doth not always forthwith deal with men according to their deserts herein ; . . . much less doth he allow others to deprive them of this power because of every abuse thereof ; witness, among others, the examples of the pagan princes in the apostles' times, who, through their ignorance, infidelity, pride, and other sins, could not but in great measure abuse their authority ; and yet the Holy Ghost commands the Christians to be 'subject' and obedient thereunto.^d Not to 'obey' them indeed, in doing evil at their commands ; for, in such case, they must 'obey God rather than man.'^e Yet still they must be 'subject' to the 'powers' either actively or passively, even then when the powers were sinfully abused. . . . And if it be

^a Eph. vi. 4 ; Col. iii. ; Deut. vi. 7 ; xxi. &c.

^c P. 455.

^d Rom. xiii. 1—7 ; Tit. iii. 1.

^b Prov. xxix. 18.

^e Acts v. 29.

so in commonwealths, and families, why may we not say the same of churches? Or how will it follow, if a church shall abuse their power, that other churches, in such cases, may take away the power from such a church?.. Christ hath given to every church a power of administration, which, if they manage not aright, and do abuse the same, the Lord Jesus will be displeased with them for this abuse; and other churches may and ought to advise them and admonish them, and testify against them for the same; but for the power itself, as Christ himself doth not forthwith deprive them thereof, so much less may other churches take it from them; for who gave them this authority?.. Churches are all of equal authority, and not one superior or inferior to another. . . Mal-administration in a congregation may possibly be but pretended and not real; and the administration of the classis may, peradventure, be really such; in which case Mr. Rutherford saith the power of the classis 'is not of Christ;' but their 'voices' ought *de jure* to be swallowed up by the congregation and the Elders thereof!.. Therefore, for aught that doth yet appear, supreme ministerial church power, which I conceive must needs be somewhere, may as well be in the congregation as in the classis."

In the next chapter, or the twelfth, the subjects are, "Whether it be against the light of nature, that the adverse party be judge: and, Whether Mr. Rutherford can safely say that none of them do so teach: and, Whether this saying, That parties may not be judges, do make against entireness of power in a congregation, any more than in a general, or national council." After repeating here, charges against Rutherford of perplexing the sentiments he purported to find in the "Answer" to Herle,—“our words much differing from those which Mr. Rutherford sets down as ours;” and also, after showing here, as elsewhere, various contradictions between Herle and Rutherford, and between Rutherford in one place against Rutherford in another; Mather remarks “if so great an oversight be found in him, I hope himself may be entreated to be tender of aggravating matters against us or others; at leastwise, not so far to aggravate them as to impute unto us matters which we do not hold. . . And Christian readers may be warned hereby, not hastily to receive all that Mr. Rutherford hath written; . . though, nevertheless, he is otherwise a man of great worth, and so ever to be acknowledged.” The chapter concludes in this form, “Taking,” Mather says, “what is granted, That no ‘light of nature’ forbids a congregation when it is alone, to have entireness of jurisdiction within itself; nor forbids the same to the general, or national council: I think it may hence be inferred, that the like must be allowed to congregational churches that have neighbours; and that entireness of jurisdiction in these is no more against ‘the light of nature’ than in the other. For to say that one congregation may have this entireness of jurisdiction, and ‘the light of nature’ allows it; and others may not, but ‘the light of nature’ forbids it; yea, to say the light of nature allows it, and then forbids it, and then it allows it again, these are such abstruse and intricate things; yea, so apparently incongruous and inconsistent; that it passeth my understanding to perceive how they can stand together.”

The thirteenth chapter embraces these particulars, “Whether the

churches at Thessalonica and Jerusalem were, each of them, more than one congregation : and, Of Mr. Baynes, his judgment therein. Of the 'assembly' mentioned Luke xii. 1. : and, Whether our Saviour did there speak to his disciples only, or to all the people also : " Mather exclaims, " I may justly wonder " that Mr. Rutherford should mention Mr. Baynes in this cause ; " for if ever there was a man in this world that denied many congregations to be one church ; and allowed only such churches to be instituted of Christ as may meet, ordinarily, in one congregation, this Mr. Baynes was one of them ! . . .^a Therefore, though he grant a numerous 'multitude' in this church at Jerusalem ; yet Mr. Rutherford's purpose, for many congregations in Thessalonica and yet all but one church, is not gained."

In the three next chapters the inquiry is pursued, respecting the largeness of numbers in the churches at Corinth, at Ephesus, and at Antioch ; all which churches Mather maintains to have been but each one congregation. And, in the seventeenth chapter, he confirms the judgment which he and Mr. Thompson had laid down in their " Answer " to Herle,^b That " women and children " are not to act in such matters as ordination, and excommunication ; " the one being debarred by their sex, and the other for want of understanding and discretion."

Remarks on Mr. Rutherford's report of certain Synodical Propositions, occur in the eighteenth chapter ; and as those remarks relate to what is strictly historical, and are also necessary to the right understanding of what actually occurred in the affair alluded to ; we cannot withhold this statement : " Our Reverend Author falls to 'scanning,' as he saith, some 'Synodical Propositions of the churches of New England,' as he calls them ; together with a table of church power, which he calls, 'The Table of New England.' But with favour of so worthy a man, he doth greatly mistake the matter ; for neither was there any such synod, nor synodical propositions, as he speaks of ; nor any such Table of New England as he mentioneth. There was, indeed, at Cambridge, in the year 1643, a printed conference of some of the Elders of that country ; where sundry points of church judgment were privately discoursed of, and this was all. But as the meeting was not a synod, as synods are usually understood, so neither were there any 'synodical propositions' there agreed upon, nor any 'table' of propositions agreed upon to be given forth as the doctrine of New England. This I am able to testify, having been present at that meeting from the beginning thereof unto the end. . . . What information he goeth upon, I know not : . . . peradventure some, in their simplicity meaning no hurt, may have called that private conference by the name and term of a 'synod,' and Mr. Rutherford might thereupon adventure to publish in print as here we see. . . . Himself, and others, may do well and wisely hereafter, to be informed by good and sufficient intelligence of such things as they publish to the world concerning the churches in New England."

We pass by four other chapters as containing only explanatory matter against Rutherford's misrepresentations. " He greatly wrongs our words,

^a In " The Diocesan's Trial ; wherein all the Sinews of Dr. Downham's 'Defence' are brought into three Heads, and orderly disposed." 1621.

^b P. 8.

and thereby wrongs the reader;" thus Mather complains, under the twentieth chapter; "by leaving out those words wherein the plainness and strength of our argumentation lies." And at the end of the succeeding chapter, touching "the supreme magistrate," he writes, "We neither had mind nor meaning to meddle at all with that question, Whether churches may assemble in national synods against the temporal magistrates' will? . . . And therefore, for his discourse which here he falls upon, maintaining at large against malignants, and, namely, against Thomas Fuller, that the Reformation begun in Scotland and prosecuted in England against the King's will, is lawful and warrantable by the Word: this discourse, I say, being altogether concerning others and not us, I will therefore pass it over."

To Rutherford's requirement, in the twenty-third chapter,—“we desire our brethren to prove, which they must if they oppose our principles, that the word ‘church’ is never taken for eldership alone in all the Word of God;” Mather replies, “Must we prove a negative? . . . If we prove what we undertook, we have done as much as can in reason be required of us: . . . that the word ‘church’ is taken for a congregation in other Scriptures besides 1 Chron. xiv.; and this we have performed. . . Mr. Rutherford himself allowing some of our proofs for good!”

The next chapter, relating, in part, to “Those children of Israel, Num. viii. 10.,” contains this passage, “It is marvel that our Reverend Brother should thus go on in representing our words and mind amiss; for as here he sets down the objection under our name, some of our words are changed and altered, others being substituted; . . . some are wholly suppressed, as if there had been none such; and others are added as ours which never came from us.” Subsequently Mather writes, “‘There is not,’ saith he, ‘a place in all the Word of God, where People confer ordination to the pastors of the New Testament; therefore our Brethren flee to the Old Testament, to prove it from the Levites.’ . . . We have given a reason,” Mather continues, “why no such Scripture can be expected in the New Testament, namely, because in those times Elders were not wanting; for there were the apostles and apostolic men, who were Elders in all the churches: and we do willingly grant that ‘where Elders are not wanting, imposition of hands is to be performed by the Elders.’ . . .^a If it be such a disparagement to our cause, . . . how will Mr. Rutherford free his own way from another objection, which we think as sore and weighty against the same? . . . I mean, . . . That there is not any place in all the New Testament, where ordinary pastors or elders imposed hands on ordinary pastors or elders; but all the examples, . . . where either the persons imposing, or the persons on whom hands were imposed, or both, were officers of extraordinary note and degree, such as now are not extant in the church, but are ceased long ago! Not that I deny but an argument may be taken from those examples, for imposition of hands in these days; but the thing I stand upon is this, That no example can be given from Scripture directly parallel to the way which our Brethren in these days do practise and allow; but some dissonancy will be found therein from their way as well, and

^a “Answer,” p. 49.

perhaps as much, as from the way of imposition of hands performed by the People in some cases. Let them tell us of Acts vi. 6, and xiv. 23, and 1 Tim. v. 23; and we answer, The persons imposing hands in those places were apostles and evangelists, such as our Brethren are not, nor do so account themselves. Let them name Acts xiii. 3, and 1 Tim. iv. 14; and we answer, The persons on whom hands were there laid were the like, even apostles and evangelists, whatever the imposers were; and therefore neither will these places perfectly suit the case. So that if we could give no example in the New Testament, of imposition of hands performed, in some cases, by the People, we think Mr. Rutherford and our Brethren of his way might be favourable to us for their own sake!"

Chapter the twenty-fifth comprises the points "Whether a minister's 'calling' consist in election, or in imposition of hands; and, whether of those is greater; and, whether is prior, or posterior: Whether 1 Tim. iv. 14, Acts vi. 2—4, xiii. 1—3, do prove that the minister's 'calling' consist in imposition of hands by the presbytery; and, that such imposition of hands is not a consummatory rite, or benedictory sign: also, Whether Rom. x. 15, do prove that a man cannot be a minister except some presbytery ordain him afore the People choose him; and, whether otherwise, the People do send a minister to themselves: and, Whether the People of God may not as well discern a man's fitness to be ordained, as his fitness to be elected." Mather writes here, "Take 'ordination' as we take it, for imposition of hands on a church officer, and then we think it less than election, as being but a note or ceremony used at a minister's entrance into his office, but not at all of the essence thereof. . . Election is something essential, and so consequently more than imposition of hands, which is but a rite, or ceremony, which may be absent and yet a man have all the essentials of a minister notwithstanding. As for 1 Tim. iv. 14, . . . I consider it only an approbatory sign or rite, which might be used by inferiors towards superiors: for Timothy being an evangelist, how could any ordinary presbytery have authority over him or give authority to him? . . .^a The substance of the Levites' 'calling' was in the immediate designment and appointment of the Lord, and not in the performance of this laying on of hands: and therefore it follows, that if laying on of hands were granted to be a ministerial act, yet still it may be merely a benedictory sign, and the substance, or essence, of the minister's 'calling' not consist in it, but in something else. . . If God do furnish a man with gifts and a holy propensity of mind to the work in general, and to such or such a people in particular, and make way by his Providence thereto; then, who can deny but such a man is 'sent'^b of God, unto that people? And then, if that people, observing God's sending of him in this sort, do hereupon elect and choose him, and promise to be obedient to him in the Lord; what is there now wanting to the substance and essence of such a man's 'calling' to such a people? And yet the man is not 'sent' by them to themselves, but 'sent' by God, and received and chosen by them. . . And to understand it otherwise would be to condemn the prophets and apostles, who were not

^a "See more in the 'Plea for the Churches in New England,' pt. ii. chap. xii. qu. 2, 4."

^b Rom. x. 15.

'sent' by men at all, and yet did truly answer to this Scripture, in that they were 'sent' of God. True it is, ordinary ministers are not 'sent' of God in such an extraordinary way as the prophets and apostles were, but in an ordinary way, and by ordinary means; which way and means if they do observe, they also may be truly said to be 'sent' of God unto the people. . . It would be requisite to be cleared, that some men besides the church have authority to send ministers to the church; and who these men are that have such authority had need be cleared also; which, I, for my part, think will not be done in haste! . . . Mr. Rutherford . . . should have given some reason why the people may discern a man's fitness for election, and yet not discern his fitness for ordination; for this is the consequence of our argument, which he denies."

The last, or twenty-sixth chapter, upon "Whether the epistle to Timothy and Titus" prove that the action of laying on of hands "may not, in any case, be performed by non-officers, etc.," presents nothing for our purpose beyond the remark that "as for Timothy, Scripture tells what the presbytery did to him, but what he must do with the presbytery it tells us nothing. . . If there be rules in the epistles that do belong to Elders alone, yet since it is confessed, and may not be denied, that other things therein do concern all Christians, how shall we be assured that such passages as concern laying on of hands are of the former sort, and not of the latter? For to say 'it is so,' and 'it is clear,' we think doth not 'clear' it at all!"

CHAP. XLV.

FERNE AND BRIDGE ON RESISTANCE.—BOOK OF SPORTS BURNT.—
ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES CALLED.—THEIR ADDRESS TO THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY.—SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.—THE FIVE DISSENT-
ING BRETHREN.

NOT the most inefficient of the timely manifestations of that moral heroism which dared to discuss, in a tyrannical reign, the just relationship of Princes and Subjects,—but which it had been the long labour of venal parasites and prostituted advocates of a Church virtually above the King, and a King claiming to be above the laws, to disparage and to vilify,—were produced by the pens of Herle,^a Burroughes,^b and others, compatriots with Milton, and precursors of Locke and Hoadly; all whose efforts have succeeded in deducing from the immaculate precepts of primordial reason and Divine institution—and, consequently, determined—the basis and the boundaries of Civil Government, in a Christian State.

^a "An Answer to Mised Dr. Hen. Ferne, according to his own Method of his Book. 1642." And, "A Fuller Answer to a Treatise written by Dr. Ferne, intitled 'The Resolving of Conscience, &c.' Lond. 1642."

^b "The Glorious Name of God, the Lord of Hosts, opened in two Sermons; with a Postscript: Briefly answering a late Treatise by Henry Ferne, D.D. By Jeremiah Burroughes. Lond. 1643." 4to.

When Charles had retired to York, one of his attendants, "having the honour to be the first that printed anything, as it is said, for the King," put out, in November,^a "The Resolving of Conscience: Upon this Question, Whether upon such a Supposition or Case as is now usually made,—'The King will not discharge his Trust, but is bent or seduced to subvert Religion, Laws, and Liberties,'—Subjects may take Arms and resist? And, Whether that Case be now? By H. Fern[e], D.D.—York, 1642." 4to. pp. 50.^b Among the answers which rapidly appeared, was "The Wounded Conscience cured, the Weak one strengthened, and the Doubting satisfied: By way of Answer to Doctor Ferne.—Lond. 1642." 4to. This first attack by Bridge, was met with "Conscience Satisfied, that there is no Warrant for the Arms now taken up by Subjects: By way of Reply unto several Answers made to a Treatise formerly published for The Resolving of Conscience upon the Case: Especially unto that which is intituled 'A Fuller Answer.' By H. Ferne, D.D. Oxf. 1643." 4to. pp. 85. No time was lost, unnecessarily, in producing "The Truth of the Times Vindicated: Whereby the Lawfulness of Parliamentary Proceedings in taking up of Arms is Justified; Dr. Ferne's 'Reply' Answered; and the Case in Question

^a Ath. Ox. edit. Bliss. vol. iii. col. 534.

^b Reprinted, Lond. 1643. 4to. In the first edition, Ferne writes, "Conscience will discern whether part[y] is upon the defensive, by inquiring first, Who were first in Arms? He that can number the succession of books and months in his almanack may decide this. He shall find that armed men were thrust into Hull; the King's arms seized against his will; the militia set up, and by that the King's subjects drawn into arms before the King had anything to oppose but proclamations: that subscriptions for plate, money, horse; that listing of soldiers for the field, and appointing of officers of the army; were begun upon their part, before his Majesty did the like." p.36. Milton supplies an answer to these queries, incidentally, in his "Eiconoclastes," 1649, where he says, "Hull and the magazine there had been secretly attempted under the King's hand; from whom, though in his Declarations renouncing all thought of war, notes were sent over sea for supply of arms; which were no sooner come, but the inhabitants of Yorkshire and other counties were called to arms, and actual forces raised, while the Parliament were yet petitioning in peace, and had not one man listed. As to the act of hostility, though not much material in whom first it began, or by whose commissions dated first, after such counsels and preparations discovered, and so far advanced by the King, yet in that act also he will be found to have had precedence, if not at London by the assault of his armed court upon the naked people, and his attempt upon the House of Commons, yet certainly at Hull, first by his close practices on that town, next by his siege. Thus, whether counsels, preparations, or acts of hostility, be considered, it appears with evidence enough, though much more might be said, that the King is truly charged to be the first beginner of these civil wars. To which may be added as a close, that in the Isle of Wight he charged it upon himself at the public treaty, and acquitted the Parliament!" Chap. x.—It will be useful to remind the reader here, that in Laud's obnoxious Canons of 1640, the first, or that "Concerning the Regal Power," directs to be read "upon some one Sunday in every quarter of the year," that "The most high and sacred order of Kings is of Divine right, being the ordinance of God himself, founded in the prime laws of nature, and clearly established by express texts both of the Old and New Testaments. . . For Subjects to bear Arms against their King, offensive or defensive, upon any pretence whatsoever, is at the least to resist the powers which are ordained of God: and though they do not invade, but only resist, St. Paul tells them plainly, 'They shall receive to themselves damnation.'" And all the Clergy are required to "exhort their people" that "they presume not to speak of his Majesty's Power in any other way than in this Canon is expressed."

more fully Resolved. By William Bridge, Preacher of God's Word, at Great Yarmouth.—Printed according to Order.—Lond. 1643." 4to. pp. 54. This piece will afford some insight into the nature of the controversy.

In his Dedication, to the Right Worshipful the Knights and Gentlemen, Deputy Lieutenants of the County of Norfolk, the author tells them that "because it hath pleased God to lay the foundation of your proceedings in your good success at Crowland, by the hand of that worthy gentlemen Sir Miles Hobert, I wish you that blessing which the Abbot of Crowland... would have made the foundation thereof, *Perpetuam felicitatem*." ^a But in an Advertisement, signed I. A., ^b they are informed that Dr. Ferne's Reply "somewhile went up and down in the dark;" that when it fell into the hands of this author "he soon dispatched his answer," but "new Licensers being appointed, much time was spent." Bridge's Introduction follows: here he writes, "The disputing time is almost now over; the Doctor hath stayed so in bringing up his rear, that I fear the controversy depending is now rather to be determined with the dint of the sword than with the strength of the pen... I am not unwilling, for truth's sake, once more to appear in this cause... It is not long since I met with the Doctor's 'Reply:' and at the first, I thought it not necessary to give any answer unto it: partly, because the subject is so well beaten that he is almost answered before he hath objected; partly, because I count the 'Reply' scarce worth a solemn answer, which is clothed with so many scoffing jeers and vile reproaches, things unworthy of a D. D., especially such as pretend satisfaction of conscience; but it will find entertainment with conscience according to its own nature... Yet, because I have been earnestly desired, by friends, to open more fully the nature of Government, and Civil Government of England, I am not unwilling to set pen to paper again."

The treatise consists of six chapters. In the first, are laid down six propositions "Concerning the nature of government, rule, and authority; or ruling and governing power." Noticing the literal interpretation of *ἐξουσία*, Rom. xiii. 1.,—a liberty, or authority, to work or act towards others;—and having instanced where else in Scripture, it is used in the abstract, and where in the concrete, Bridge remarks, after Gerard ^c and others, that it was advisedly used here in "an abstractive manner" to show that not the persons so much as their office is what we ought to regard. And the dominion of jurisdiction which is Civil, and concerning which is "our question," if not distinguished from the absolute dominion of property, produces "State errors." Secular, or civil power, he defines, after Alman, ^d to be "that power which regularly is given to one or more, by the People, for the ordering and preservation of the Commonwealth, according to the civil laws thereof." The voice of

^a Among Bridge's works is "A Sermon preached unto the Volunteers of the City of Norwich, and also to the Volunteers of Great Yarmouth in Norfolk. Lond. 1642." 4to.

^b Perhaps John Arrowsmith, D. D. See Brook's Hist. Puritans vol. iii. p. 315.

^c In Epist. ad Rom.

^d De Potest. Eccl. et Laic. i. q. i. apud Gerson.

nature is the voice of God: on this axiom Bridge says, "now nature itself teacheth" that justice cannot be administered in a community, "unless authority, power, or jurisdiction, be first appointed; for what hath a private man to do to put another to death? 'Thou shalt not kill,' is made to all men." The apostle Peter is not, he remarks, inconsistent in using the phrase ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις 'a human constitution, or creature,' epist. i. ch. ii. 13.; for he is speaking of the form or qualification of the "abstractive power," as monarchy, aristocracy, democracy; the channels in which this power runs; and the apostle says, therefore "be subject to *every* ordinance of man."

The first subject seat and receptacle of ruling civil power under God, is the whole People, or body politic: "to this purpose," Bridge, after having adduced several strong authorities, instances in the maxims of the council of Basil, "Plus valet Regnum quam Rex; The Kingdom is more worth than the King." He supports his position, or proposition, by Old Testament examples and illustrations, until he arrives at where it might be pressed against him, that this is all set aside since the New Testament assures us that "the powers that be are *ordained* of God," so not of man! Remarking that the word "ordained" should rather have been "ordered" in that place, ^a "Government," he says, "is of God two ways; either by immediate donation, as that of Moses, or by mediate derivation, as that of judges and the kings of Israel. The government of princes is not now by immediate donation or designation, but by mediate derivation, and so is both of God and man too; as Fortescue speaks, Quicquid facit causa secunda, facit et causa prima." Adducing, next, several passages from Dr. Ferne's Reply, Bridge brings them into contrast with other passages; thus, "First, whereas the Doctor saith that the first kings were not by the choice of the people 'at the first;' and, that popular election was a kind of 'defection from and a disturbance to that natural way of descent, of governing kingly power, by a paternal right,' I refer Dr. Ferne unto Dr. Ferne, who saith, both in his first and second book,—page 67 of his Reply—'It is probable that kings, at first, were by election here as elsewhere.' . . We take it not unkindly, that the Doctor cannot agree with us, seeing he cannot agree with himself! Secondly; Whereas he saith 'monarchical government is not a mere invention of man, as aristocracy and democracy are,' I refer him to what he saith himself,—first book, p. 13, 14,—'We must distinguish Power itself, and the qualification of that power, in several forms of government: if we consider the qualification of this governing power and the manner of executing it, according to the several forms of government; we granted it before to be the invention of man. And when such a qualification or form is orderly agreed upon, we say it hath God's permissive approbation.' Yet, in his Reply, he makes this form of monarchical government, rather an appointment of God both *ductu naturæ* and *exemplo divino*; and 'not a mere invention of man' as other forms of government are. Here, I must leave him to agree with himself! Thirdly; Whereas he saith 'That the first fathers of mankind were the first kings and rulers.'"—Bridge shows the contrary from Scripture; and brings proofs from Austin and others out of Mendoza, ^b

^a Dr. Doddridge renders, "disposed."

^b Tom. i. Annot. ~~viii~~. Proem. sect. 6.

“that kingly government fell [out] in the fourth age of the world.” And, fourthly; Whereas the Doctor tells us “that this government ‘is natural though not *jure*, yet *ductu naturæ*,’.. Molina^a will tell him that ‘Power is of two sorts, .. natural, as the power of a father over his children; .. and the will of men, .. to subject themselves to the supreme:’ so that paternal and civil power are not the same, but have two originals. .. Besides,” adds Bridge, “if paternal government do lead us to regal, then kings should and ought to rule as arbitrarily in their kingdoms as fathers do in their families; and if subjects deny this arbitrary power to them, they sin, because they are led thereunto by nature! And so all the kingdoms of the world should lie in this sin: for in what kingdom of the world doth a king rule as arbitrarily as a father in his family?.. Fifthly; Whereas the Doctor saith, this monarchical government was the first government that God set up ‘in Moses, Judges and Kings of Israel,’ and so, though not ‘*jure divino*, yet *exemplo divino*;’ I confess,” says Bridge, “I cannot but wonder at the conceit, seeing the difference between the government of the Judges and Kings is so abundantly made out. .. Surely, God, at the first, by all we can read in the Scripture, was pleased to appoint Magistracy itself, and left the children of men free to set up that way and form of government which, in prudence, might best correspond with their condition; still making People the first subject and receptacle of civil power. In proof whereof I have stayed the longer, it being the foundation of all this controversy. .. Therefore, the Prince, or supreme magistrate, hath no more power than what is communicated to him from the community, because the effect doth not exceed the virtue of its cause. .. So, the People, or community, cannot give away from themselves the power of self-preservation. .. Therefore no act of a community can cut off this entail from their posterity, or make such a deed of conveyance whereby themselves and their children should be spoiled of self-preservation! .. Then, in case the Prince doth neglect his trust so as not to preserve them, but to expose them to violence, it is no usurpation for them to look to themselves, which yet may be no act of jurisdiction over the prince, or taking away of any power from him which they gave him, but is, in truth, a stirring up, acting, and exercising, of that power which always was left in themselves.”

From power in general, Bridge descends, in his second chapter, to “the governing and ruling power of England.” And here he introduces among some others, from “Learned Fortescue, Lord Chief Justice, and after Lord Chancellor, in King Henry the Sixth’s time,” these remarkable passages, “The form of institution of a politic Kingdom, is that where a king is made and ordained for the defence of the law of his subjects, and of their bodies and goods, whereunto he receiveth power of his people, for that he cannot govern his people by any other power.’.. ‘The King of England cannot alter or change the laws of his realm at his pleasure, for he governeth his people by power, not only royal but also politic.’”^b Bridge then instances that even William the Conqueror had not come to the crown “without all conditions.” And he

^a De Jure et Just. Disp. xx. Tract. 2.

^b De Laudibus Legum Angliæ, cap. xiii. ix.

reasons thereupon, that "If it be said, that this People are .. as a people merely conquered, then any sword that is longer than the prince's may fetch back that power again. If it be said, that this People gave away this power by indenture, at the first election of their prince, then let men show us such indenture. If it be said, that God hath forbidden such a forcible resistance by Rom. xiii. 1—3, or the like Scriptures, then it must be affirmed that the Parliament are not 'the highest powers,' which Dr. Ferne granteth.^a For if the Parliament come within the compass of those words 'higher powers,' then that Scripture Rom. xiii. doth not reach them; but rather requires others to be obedient to them: yea, if by 'the higher powers' is understood only the King, then the two Houses may not make any forcible resistance against any petty constable that comes in the King's authority to do violence to the two Houses. Surely, therefore, this and the like Scriptures are much abused; the meaning being only to command obedience to authority in all things that tend to the encouragement of good, and punishment of evil: and, therefore, there is such a power in the Subjects, both by the law of nature and constitution of the Kingdom, to take up Arms, when the State, or two Houses, express it; notwithstanding the expression of any one man to the contrary."

In the third chapter, Bridge writes, "I now come to the Vindication of the Truth, as opposed by Dr. Ferne, in his last book, called 'Conscience Satisfied,' wherein he spends the seven former chapters mostly in answer to a book called 'A Fuller Answer.' In his eighth section, he comes to examine such grounds as I premised for the lawfulness of Parliamentary proceedings in taking up of Arms as now they do. . . 'Mr. Bridge tells us,' saith the Doctor, 'that there are three grounds of their proceeding by Arms: to fetch in Delinquents to their trial; to secure the State from foreign invasion; to preserve themselves from Popish rebellion.' Dr. Ferne replieth, 'Yet this must be done in an orderly and legal way; and if conscience would speak the truth, it could not say that any Delinquents were denied or withheld till the Militia was seized, and a great Delinquent, in the matter of Hull, was denied to be brought to trial at his Majesty's instance.' How true this is that the Doctor writes, all the world knows I need not say. The Parliament, to this day, never denied to try any that were accused by the King, so that they might be tried legally by himself and the two Houses; which is the known privilege of every parliament-man, according to law."

Passing by, from necessity, much of Bridge's argument here, we take it up with these words, "'Of the French and Low Country Divines, he brings no testimony,' saith the Doctor; 'but, for proof, tells us, we know their practice; so I, for answer, may return him his own words, we know what hath been the practice of those Protestants, and so they are parties interested not so fit to give in witness.' Very well; if they be 'parties interested,' and so not fit 'to give in witness,' then they are of our judgment! Observe, Reader, here he granteth that the Protestant Churches, and the Divines of France and the Low Countries, 'are parties interested,' and so of our judgment; what Protestant Churches or Divines, then, will he allege for his sentence? Will he have the

^a Reply, p. 62.

Divines of Switzerland? I brought a testimony of the Divines of the Council of Basil; and that he doth not contradict! Are the Divines of Geneva of his mind? I brought the testimony of Calvin; that he saith nothing to, but it passeth with him as granted by him! Are the Divines of Scotland? I brought him the testimony of Master Buchanan; that testimony also he doth not deny! It may be that was but one, and so would not take notice of it; read, therefore, what Master Knox saith, . . . and what the judgment of the Scots' Divines is for the present . . . But it may be the Doctor will tell us that the Scottish Divines are also 'parties' and 'interested' in the cause. Very good: we shall shortly have a great party in the Protestant Churches for us and with us: what Divines, then, are against us, in the Doctor's opinion? Are the Divines of England? He tells us also, 'Yet do some of them allow of Resistance, in some cases.' Good still: by and by it will arise to somewhat; here is yet more of our party,—as the Doctor calls them,—by his own confession! As for the testimonies that I brought, of Dr. Bilson and Dr. Willet, he saith 'that is plain, they speak of such government, such states, such cases, as will not agree to this kingdom, at this time.' But why not, the Doctor will not tell us! . . . When the Doctor, or other, bring forth testimonies of Divines, ancient or late, to prove that Subjects may not take up Arms against their Prince, they had as good say nothing; that is not to our case: but let them prove by testimonies, that it is not lawful for the Parliament to take up Arms to secure the Kingdom, to bring accused persons to trial, and to deliver the Prince out of the hands of Malignants; and then they say something to us, else it is but clamour, not reason."

The fourth chapter does not admit of more than slight notices of points more or less pertinent to the subject. "He would prove,"^a Bridge remarks, "that the people of Israel did not by any forcible resistance 'rescue' Jonathan out of the hands of Saul; which work, says he, was but set off 'with a soldier like boldness.' Let the Doctor call this work what he please, Saul, the King, had sworn that Jonathan should die; and the People sware he should not die, and they being in arms 'did rescue Jonathan,' saith the text.^b This 'rescue' the Doctor calls in his first book,^c 'a loving violence,' and, in his Reply, 'a setting off the matter with a soldierly boldness!' I hope the Doctor will give us leave to use like terms, if a Prince swear the death of some parliamentary-men who deserve not to die, but to be preferred, and 'the People rise up in arms and rescue' their 'Jonathans,' saying, 'as we live, they shall not die that have wrought this great deliverance for us;' this is no resistance, it is but 'a loving violence,' and 'a setting off the matter with a soldierly boldness!' Why may not we call this so, as well as the Doctor, that? But I appeal to all reason, Whether a 'rescue' by men in arms from those that have sworn a man's death, be not forcible resistance! But say we, this is more than 'prayers and tears;' which is the only remedy allowed by the Doctor. To which he replieth, 'The Doctor had nowhere said, though Mr. Bridge makes him often say so, That prayers and tears, is the only remedy left for Subjects; but, besides their cries to God, he allows their intercessions, reproofs, denial of subsidies and

^a P. 49.^b 1 Sam. xiv. 45.^c P. 51.

aids.' I will not search into the Doctor's book for every word; take what he granteth here, yet this 'soldierly boldness' of 'rescuing' is more than prayers, tears, reproofs, or denial of subsidies and aids; which is all the remedy that he affordeth, as he confesseth now. Yet the Doctor is so full of this sentence still, that he saith 'that the children of Israel being under the oppression of their kings, had no remedy but crying to the Lord;' and again, 'all the remedy they had was by crying to the Lord:' so also, in his first book,^a 'The people are let to understand, 1 Sam. viii. 11—18, how they should be oppressed under kings, and have no remedy left them but crying to the Lord.'^b Thus do men forget themselves and what they have said, while they contend against the truth!" And thus does Bridge meet his opponent, in other points; as that urged of David, who took up arms to defend himself from the violence of his prince, Saul. "The Doctor replies," he says, "now, 'that David's example was extraordinary:' well! but when it is said that David, having advantage of Saul, did not lay his hands upon him to cut him off, as he might have done;^c what if we should say, that act of David 'was extraordinary;' would not the Doctor tell us that our answer was but ordinary? .. But be it so that David's example was 'extraordinary;' is not our case, now, extraordinary? Is England's case ordinary? Hath it been thus, ordinarily, that arms have been taken up against the Parliament; and Delinquents kept from legal trial by force of arms? Has this been, for many years? See how the Doctor helps himself by this 'extraordinary' answer!" The remainder of this chapter consists of passages of Scripture "delivered" by Bridge from his adversary's "objections."

The fifth chapter, consisting but of replications of what one and the other had said in their former pieces respectively, presents nothing of interest that can be detached. In the sixth and last chapter, they dispute after this manner: "Whereas the Doctor had said we sharpen many of our weapons 'at the Philistine's forge;' and I had showed the difference between us and Papists in this cause; he replieth, 'difference there must needs be between you and Papists, in this particular, for they challenge such a power from the Pope, you from the People.' Very well! And is not here a vast difference, The Papists say, the Pope

^a P. 10.

^b Heylyn instances in the case of Julian's attempt to subvert Christianity,—in which, however, he confines himself to when that empire "began to intrench upon the liberties of the Christians,—they knew no other way, nor weapons, by which to make resistance to such lawless violence, but their prayers and tears: *καὶ τοῦτο μόνον κατὰ τοῦ διώκτου φάρμακον*; and this was all the 'medicine' which they had to cure that malady, as we find in Nazianzen, Orat. i. in Julian. The like I could produce from St. Ambrose, Orat. v., were not this sufficient." The Rebel's Catechism. 1643-[4]. 4to. p. 9.—It may be asked, whether even "prayers and tears" do not come under Heylyn's description of "the rebellion of the heart, and of the tongue:" praying and crying being "words" and "deeds," and so making "a man guilty of 'damnation' in the sight of God?" p. 2, 3. A recent historian remarks that Julian's reign did not last two years, and that "had he been suffered by Providence much longer to persist in his aggression, with proportionate increase of severity, it is probable that the final triumph of Christianity would not otherwise have been achieved than by the means of a religious war." Hist. of the Church from the Earliest Ages, &c. By George Waddington, M. A. 1833. 8vo. chap. viii. p. 109.

^c 1 Sam. xxiv. 4.

may depose princes; we say, in case the prince doth not perform his trust, the people may look to their own safety? . . . We say, with Chrysostom and others, that every soul, even Priests, as they and you call them, are to be subject to higher Powers: that it lies in the power of no Priest to depose princes. . . . Again, whereas I said 'the Papists hold it lawful to kill a prince; and, that a private man, invested with the Pope's authority, may do it; we abhor it:' the Doctor replieth 'That is their new forge under ground, set up of late by Jesuits. I did not mean you sharpened your weapons there, but at the old forge; and however you say you abhor this doctrine of killing kings, yet I fear and tremble to think if your Sovereign had fallen in battle by the edge of your sword or shot of your artillery, you would have found him guilty of his own death in that he would not, being desired, forbear to go down himself into battle.' It is well the Doctor will excuse us from Jesuitism in this particular; and well he may in all things else: especially here, where he knows there is so much correspondency between his own opinion and the Jesuits'; who, for the most part of them, hold that as all Ecclesiastical power is given to Peter, and so to the Pope and Bishops, not to the Church; so all Civil power is given immediately to the King and not to the Commonwealth, but only as derived from him! And, therefore, well may the Doctor excuse us from whetting our swords at the 'new forge' of the Jesuits, that being a forge which he reserves to whet his own weapons at. Neither do we whet our weapons 'at the old forge;' for I suppose the Doctor will say that Aquinas' forge is of the oldest frame, and he speaketh directly contrary to us, thus; 'As soon as ever any is denounced excommunicate for apostacy from the faith, his Subjects are, *ipso facto*, absolved from his dominion and the oath of allegiance whereby they were bound to him.'^a We say, if a shot of our artillery had fallen on the King,—whereas you say, we 'would have found him guilty of his own death,'—we say we would have found you and such as you are, guilty thereof, that put him on such designs! . . . But in this matter, Doctor, you have answered yourself, for you told us in your former treatise, 'That it is lawful for Subjects to ward their Prince's blows, to hold his hands, and the like.' Now, if the Prince raise an army against his Subjects, how can his blows be warded but by an army? . . . And then answer yourself, 'What if a shot of artillery should fall upon your Prince?' . . . 'But who knows not,' saith the Doctor, 'if that party of Brownists and Anabaptists which are now so prevalent in the arms taken up against the King, should get the upper hand, what would become of the King's supremacy and government?' Here is a loud cry against 'Brownists and Anabaptists;' but who are 'Brownists?' Not all those that are against Prelates and not for the English Common Prayer-Book; for, then, all the Reformed Churches are Brownists. And as for 'Anabaptists,' I wish it may be considered, whether they do not take some footing for their opinion from the Common Prayer-Book: they deny baptism to infants upon this ground, Because actual faith and repentance are pre-required to baptism; and doth not the Common Prayer-Book seem to acknowledge as much, whenas before baptism, the witnesses, in name of the Infant, must answer to

^a Tho. Aq. 2. 2. q. 12. art. 2.

these questions, 'Dost thou believe? Dost thou renounce the Devil and all his works?' I must nakedly profess my judgment against that opinion; yet were it not good that the very Common Prayer-Book should come under consideration upon this, and other reasons? . . . Suppose that the army should prevail, wherein there are 'Brownists and Anabaptists,' as you say, yet is there not so much danger that they should prevail to mislead the Parliament, who are three or four hundred, as that Papists should prevail to mislead one [the King]! . . . At last, the Doctor tells us, concerning supremacy, 'that the King is supreme not so much in opposition to particular persons, as in relation to the whole body politic: . . . that the two Houses of Parliament are, in a sort, co-ordinate with his Majesty to some act or exercise of the supreme power; that is, to making laws, by yielding their consent.' And if they be 'co-ordinate' in that act of supremacy, Paræus and others will tell him that the nomothetic part of supremacy is the highest.^a We acknowledge the King our Supreme to defend us; but not to defend ourselves, where cause requires, gives a supra-supremacy unto him. . . . In the next section, the Doctor saith, 'Mr. Bridge enters upon a loose discourse against Episcopal government.' . . . No other 'loose discourse' than what his loose treatise led me into. . . . And, whereas I said, 'now the Doctor shows himself: he had rather the Kingdom should be imbrued in a bloody war than Episcopacy should down, because he had said in his treatise,^b 'that the King has reason, by power of arms, to divert the abolishing of Episcopal government;' the Doctor answers, 'Nay, Mr. Bridge, you and your party in arms show yourselves what spirit you are of, who will have this land embroiled in a bloody war, rather than Episcopacy shall not down.' Not so, Doctor! There is not the same reason why you should retort these words upon us; for I had nowhere said, the Parliament hath reason 'by power of arms' to divert the evil of that government; yea, I am so far from it, that I profess freely that if the King and Parliament would establish that government still to be continued, that the People is not bound to rise up in arms to root it out, though I judge it evil. Yea, if any man be of that opinion, I think he is to be suffered to live, enjoying himself and his estate here! . . . Good Sir; in the fear of God, make your humble addresses to his Majesty, and petition him to return to those that are faithful to him. The worst that he can lose, you know,—if you pretend rightly,—is but a piece of some prerogative, or some exercise thereof, for the present. Why should so good a land as this be imbrued in blood for such a cause; war being the worst of all evils, and therefore not to be undertaken but to prevent *gravissimum malum*? . . . Labour you to take off those exasperations that are amongst men with you; and do not still put your *unguem in ulcere ut recrudescat dolor*!"^c

^a In Rom. xiii.^b P. 25.^c Besides this, and other answers to Ferne, there appeared "Scripture and Reason pleaded for Defensive Arms: Or, The whole Controversy about Subjects taking up Arms. Wherein, besides other Pamphlets, an answer is punctually directed to Dr. Ferne's Book, intituled 'Resolving of Conscience, &c.' The Scriptures alleged are fully satisfied: The rational Discourses are weighed in the Balance of Right Reason: Matters of Fact concerning the present Differences are examined,—Published by divers Reverend and Learned Divines.—Lond. 1643." 4to. pp. 80. "A Re-

Among other measures condemnatory of the proceedings of the executive government, Heylyn tells us that in this year, 1643, "On the fifth of May, it was ordered, by no worse men than the Commons in Parliament,—the Lords either not consulted, or not concurring,—‘That His *Majesty's* book for tolerating Sports on the Lord's day, should be forthwith burned by the hands of the common hangman, in Cheapside and other usual places; and, that the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex should see the same put in execution :’ which was done accordingly. Than which, an act of a greater scorn, an act of greater insolency and disloyal impudence, was never offered to a sovereign and anointed prince!"^a Should he not rather have lamented that they who prompted Charles to republish^b this "stumbling-block,"^c had committed another offence against religion, and were consequently the real instruments of the sovereign's degradation? There were those who were no less wise and righteous than Heylyn, who have left the records of their abhorrence of that book; but so has not he.^d

The time having fully arrived when it had become expedient to practically^e encounter the difficulties or embarrassments with which the affairs of religion were encompassed; and in compliance with repeated, but as yet ineffectual appeals, commenced in the year 1641; the Parliament, apart from the King, resolved upon a novel and decisive measure. Notwithstanding that the Act of 25th of Henry VIII. cap. xix., interposed a legal obstacle on the part of the clergy touching their "submission," yet the crisis demanded an investigation of the grievances, alleged notoriously to be oppressive and noxious, which sprung from the government of the Church. A Bill had been proposed to the King, in the treaty at Oxford in 1642, for the calling of an assembly of Divines "to be consulted by the Parliament," but the proposal not having been entertained by his Majesty, the two houses proceeded with the Bill and converted it into an ordinance of their own, under the title of "An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament: For the Calling of an Assembly of Learned and Godly Divines, to be consulted with by the Parliament; for the Settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England: And for Vindicating and Clearing the Doctrine of the said Church from false Aspersions and Interpretations, as shall be most agreeable to the Word of God.—With the Names of all the Ministers appointed for the same. 12th June, 1643.—Printed June 13, 1643." 4to. pp. 6.

ply to several Treatises pleading for the Arms now taken up by Subjects in the pretended Defence of Religion and Liberty: by Name, unto the Reverend and Learned Divines with pleaded Scripture and Reason for Defensive Arms; The Author of the Treatise of Monarchy [Philip Hunton]; and, the Author of A Fuller Reply. Oxon. 1643." 4to.

^a Hist. Presb. p. 456.

^b See back, vol. i. p. 514.

^c Rom. xiv. 13.

^d Heylyn follows up the words of the above quotation, with these, "So as it was no marvel, if the Lords [!] joined with them in the Ordinance of the sixth of April, 1644, for to expose all books to the like disgrace, which had been writ, or should be writ hereafter, by any person or persons, against the morality of the Sabbath."—This Ordinance was turned into an Act, 29 Car. II. cap. vii., which they who condemn the Ordinance are bound to approve!

^e See back, p. 149. April 9th, 1642.

“WHEREAS amongst the infinite blessings of Almighty God upon this Nation, none is or can be more dear unto us, than the Purity of our Religion; and, for that as yet many things remain in the Liturgy, Discipline, and Government of the Church, which do necessarily require a further and more perfect Reformation than as yet hath been attained: And, whereas it hath been declared and resolved by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, That the present Church Government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and other Ecclesiastical Officers depending upon the Hierarchy, is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the Kingdom; a great impediment to Reformation and growth of Religion; and very prejudicial to the State and Government of this Kingdom; and that therefore they are resolved that the same shall be taken away, and that such a Government shall be settled in the Church as may be most agreeable to God’s holy Word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at Home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland, and other Reformed Churches abroad; and for the better effecting hereof, and for the vindicating and clearing of the Doctrine of the Church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions, It is thought fit and necessary to call an Assembly of Learned, Godly, and Judicious Divines, to consult and advise of such matters and things, touching the premises, as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the Houses of Parliament; and to give their advice and counsel therein, to both or either of the said Houses, when, and as often as they shall be thereunto required.— Be it therefore ordained by the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, That all and every the persons hereafter in this present Ordinance named, that is to say, Algernon, Earl of Northumberland, [a hundred and fifty more names follow], and such other person and persons as shall be nominated and appointed by both Houses of Parliament, or so many of them as shall not be letted by sickness or other necessary impediment, shall meet and assemble, and are hereby required and enjoined upon summons signed by the Clerks of both Houses of Parliament, left at their several respective dwellings, to meet and assemble themselves at Westminster in the Chapel called King Henry the Seventh’s Chapel, on the first day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and forty-three; and after the first meeting, being at least of the number of forty, shall from time to time sit, and be removed from place to place; and also, that the said Assembly shall be dissolved in such manner as by both Houses of Parliament shall be directed. . . And be it further Ordained by the authority aforesaid, That for the charges and expenses of the said Divines, and every of them, in attending the said service, there shall be allowed unto every of them that shall so attend, during the time of their said attendance, and for ten days before and ten days after, the sum of four shillings for every day, at the charges of the Commonwealth.”. .

Provision was made to limit the conferences to such matters, “and no other,” as should be proposed by either or both Houses; and that the results of the deliberations were not to be divulged “by printing, writing, or otherwise,” without consent of Parliament. Heylyn tells us,

that the Assembly was made up "of so many of the Lords [10] and Commons [20], as might both serve as well to keep them under, and control their actions, as to add some countenance unto them in the eye of the people. . . The Knights of every Shire must make choice of two to serve as members: . . most of them Presbyterians, some few Royalists, *four* of the Independent faction, and two or three to represent the Kirk of Scotland. . . His Majesty makes a start at this encroachment on his royal prerogative, and countermands the same by his Proclamation^a of the 22nd [June]."^b "Which prohibition, notwithstanding," Heylyn writes elsewhere, "most of the members authorized by that Ordinance, assembled in the Abbey of Westminster on the first of July, in contempt of his Majesty and the laws."^c

The Assembly at Westminster was no sooner organized than the Lords and Commons agreed in a Declaration to the General Assembly of Scotland. Having commended their "pious endeavours" for the preservation of the "true" Protestant Reformed religion,—“to the necessary reformation of church-discipline and government in this kingdom, and the more near union of both churches,”—the two houses of parliament "fully concurring," desire that reverend Assembly to take notice that they have called an Assembly of divers godly and learned Divines and others: "and likewise have nominated and appointed John, Earl of Rutland, Sir William Armine, Bart., Sir Henry Vane, the younger, Knt., Thomas Hatcher and Henry Darley, Esquires, Committees and Commissioners of both houses, . . to resort to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and propound and consult with them . . in all occasions which may further the so much desired Reformation in ecclesiastical matters, . . and a nearer conjunction betwixt both churches. In performance whereof, Master Stephen Marshall and Master PHILIP NYE, ministers of God's Word, . . are appointed to assist and advise . . in such things as shall concern this church. . . It is likewise desired, that that reverend Assembly will, according to their former promise and resolution, send to the Assembly here such number of godly and learned Divines as, in their wisdom, they think most expedient. . . And, that their endeavours may be more effectual, the two houses do make this request to them, . . to stir up that nation to send some competent forces in aid of this parliament and kingdom, against the many armies of the popish and prelatical party and their adherents."^d

The commissioners left London July 20th, 1643. Their arrival was earnestly looked for, the General Assembly having commenced sitting, and Baillie writes, "of purpose time was spent; for we did greatly long for the English commissioners, of whose coming we were well near out of hope."^e In the same letter, he writes, "on Monday, August 7th, after we were ashamed with waiting, at last they landed at Leith. The lords went, and conveyed them up in a coach. We were exhorted to be more grave than ordinary; and so indeed all was carried to the end with much more awe and gravity than usual. Mr. Henderson did moderate with some little austere severity, as it was necessary."^f

^a Bibl. Regia, p. 331.

^b Hist. Presb. p. 453.

^c Life of Laud, p. 507.

^d "Acts of Gen. Assembly," *infra*, p. 166.

^e Letter to Spang, Sep. 22d. No. 36. vol. i. p. 376.

^f P. 379.

A committee was appointed "to salute and welcome them;" by whom it was arranged that "their access to the Assembly, as private spectators, should be when they would; . . . but as commissioners, their access should not be immediately to the Assembly, but to some deputed to wait on them, who should report from them to the Assembly, and from it to them, what was needful. . . . When we met, four gentlemen appeared, Sir W. Armin[e], Sir H. Vane, younger, one of the gravest and ablest of that nation, Mr. Hatcher and Mr. Darley, with two ministers, Mr. Marshall and Mr. Nye."^a Besides their credentials and other documents, the English commissioners presented a letter "subscribed by above seventy of their divines, supplicating in a most deplorable style, help from us in their present most desperate condition."^b . . . All these were presented by us to the Assembly, and read openly. The letter of the private divines was so lamentable, that it drew tears from many. . . . We had hard enough debates. The English were for a civil *league*, we for a religious *covenant*. When they were brought to us in this, and Mr. Henderson had given them a draught of a covenant, we were not like to agree on the frame; they were, more than we could assent to, for keeping of a door open, in England, to INDEPENDENCY. Against this, we were peremptory. . . . At last . . . to that draught . . . all our three committees . . . did unanimously assent: from that meeting it came immediately to our Assembly: . . . it was received with the greatest applause that ever I saw anything. . . . In the afternoon, with the same cordial unanimity, it did pass the Convention of Estates. This seems to be a new period and crisis of the most great affair which these hundred years has exercised these dominions. What shall follow from this new principle, you shall hear as time shall discover."^c Friday, August 11th, "was the first day of the English appearing in our Assembly."^d The 15th, "I told . . . Mr. Henderson," says Baillie, "my opinion, that the Directory might serve for many good ends, but no ways for suppressing, but much increasing, the ill of novations. However, I assured I would make no din, but submit to him, who was much wiser than I. These my thoughts, I would not communicate to others. . . . Mr. Henderson, Mr. Calderwood, and Mr. Dickson, were voiced to draw with diligence that Directory; wherein I wish them much better success than I expect; yet in this I am comforted, that in none of our brethren who are taken with these conceits, appear, as yet, the least inclination to Independency!"^e Thursday, the 17th, Baillie continues, "was our joyful day of passing the English Covenant. . . . Friday, the 18th, a committee of eight were appointed for London. . . . Our last session was on Saturday. . . . On the Sabbath, before noon, in the new church, we heard Mr. Marshall preach with great contentment: but in the afternoon, in the Grayfriars, Mr. Nye did not please. His voice was clamorous: he touched, neither in

^a P. 380.

^b See it in "Acts of Gen. Assembly." Printed, 1682. 12mo. p. 168. "In a deeper sense of this extreme danger," say they, "threatening us and you, and all the churches, than we can express, we have made this address unto you. . . . Oh, give us the brotherly aid of your reinforced tears and prayers, that the blessings of truth and peace which our prayers alone have not obtained, yours conjoined may!"

^c P. 380—382.

^d P. 384.

^e P. 386.

prayer nor preaching, the common business. He read much out of his paper-book. All his sermon was on the common head, of a spiritual life, wherein he ran out above all our understandings, upon a knowledge of God as God, without the Scriptures, without grace, without Christ. They say he amended it somewhat the next Sabbath."^a

We can readily admit that Nye was heard with prejudice; and regret that, not having met with it, we are not benefited by particulars in "A Letter from Scotland, to his Brethren in England, concerning *his* success of affairs there. 1643." We cannot doubt, however, that he watched with Vane, with the most indefatigable care and foresight, every turn and construction in the frame of the Covenant; and not only concurred in Vane's religious but civil securities. "The main of it," Echard says, "was managed by the superior cunning and artifice of Sir Henry Vane, who, as Dr. Gumble tells us, was very earnest with the Scots to have the whole called a League, as well as a Covenant, and argued it almost all night, and at last carried it. He held another debate, about Church government, which was to be according to 'the example of the best Reformed churches;' he would have it only 'according to the Word of God!' but after a great contest, they joined both, and the last had the precedence. One of his companions afterwards asking him the reason why he should put them to so much trouble with such needless trifles; he told him, 'He was mistaken, and did not see enough into that matter, for a League showed it was between two nations and might be broken upon just reasons, but not a Covenant. For the other, that church government 'according to the Word of God,' by the difference of divines and expositors, would be long enough before it be determined, for the learned held it clearly for episcopacy; so that *when* all are agreed, we may take in the Scotch Presbytery!"^b Thus, remarks one, he "effected a saving retreat for the supporters of a just toleration."^c

Three of the Scotch commissioners, with "Mr. Hatcher and Mr. Nye, made sail on Wednesday the 30th day [of Aug.], the wind made no sooner; but some eight days before, the English had dispatched a ketch, with a double [duplicate] of our Covenant, which, when it came, was so well liked at London, that Friday, the 1st of Sept., being sent to the Assembly of Divines, it was there allowed by all, only Dr. Burgess did doubt for one night. On Saturday it passed the house of commons; on Monday, the house of peers."^d

Heylyn records of the Covenant, that "the Commons were so quick at their work, that on Monday, Sept. 25th, it had been solemnly taken by all the members of that house,^e and the Assembly of Divines, at St. Margaret's in Westminster: in the same church, within two days after, it was administered with no less solemnity to divers lords, knights, gentlemen, colonels, officers, soldiers, and others, residing in and about the city of London, a sermon being preached by Coleman,—though, otherwise, a principal Erastian, in point of government,—to justify

^a P. 387, 388.

^b Hist. of Engl. fol. vol. ii. p. 450.

^c Foster, Life of Vane. 1838. 16mo. p. 62.

^d Baillie, *sup.* p. 390.

^e The copy printed Feb. 1643—4. 4to. pp. 20, is followed by two hundred and twenty-eight names only.

the piety and legality of it:^a and, finally, enjoined to be taken on the Sunday following, in all churches and chapels of London, within the lines of communication, by all and every the inhabitants within the same, as afterwards by all the kingdom in convenient time. Prosecuted, in all places, with such cursed rigour that all such who refused to subscribe the same, and to lift up their hands to God in testimony that they called him to witness it, were turned both out of house and home—as they use to say,—not suffered to compound for their goods or lands, till they had submitted thereunto. . . . It was compared, by some, to the six-knotted whip, or statute of ‘the six articles’ in the time of Henry VIII., this Covenant drawing in the Scots, and thereby giving an occasion of shedding infinitely more blood than those ‘articles’ did. . . . Others, with no unhappy curiosity, observing the number of words . . . abstracted from the preface and conclusion of it, found them amounting, in the total, to 666, neither more nor less; . . . being the number of the Beast in the Revelation: . . . for if the Pope showed anything of the spirit of Antichrist, by bringing Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, to the stake at Oxon. this Covenant and the makers of it, did express no less, in bringing the last Protestant archbishop to the block, in London!”^b

The only portions we can present of the Covenant are the first two articles; which, and the other four, with the preamble, etc., would extend over the space of about three of these pages.—Art. I. “That we shall, sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the Reformed religion in the church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, *according to the Word of God*, and the example of the best Reformed churches; and we shall endeavour to bring the churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confessing of faith, form of church government, directory for worship and catechising; that we, and our posterity after us, may, as brethren, live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us.”—Art. II. “That we shall, in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of popery, prelacy—that is, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy,—superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine, and the power of godliness; lest we partake in other men’s sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his Name one, in the three kingdoms.”

Various constructions were endeavoured to be put on several words

^a “The Heart’s Engagement: A Sermon preached at St. Margaret’s Westminster, at the Public entering into the Covenant: &c. Sep. 29, 1643. By Thomas Coleman, Pastor of Blyton, in the County of Lincoln; and being thence driven by the Cavaliers, now Preacher at St. Peter’s Cornhill, London. 1643.” 4to. pp. 39.

^b Life of Laud, p. 511.

and clauses in the Covenant, to elude their literal import; and many contrivances were resorted to, in order to evade it altogether: so difficult is it in any case to embrace all judgments in one form of words. Malignancy and exuberance of power alone, could have driven the major part of "the three kingdoms" to combine, by such an instrument, for self-preservation! It wrought evil, in its turn; for which surely they are more to be blamed, whose mal-administration of affairs occasioned it, than they who had not the pretext of "law" to sanction the injustice they but only repaid without interest. No wonder that his Majesty's prohibition of October 9th, against the Covenant taking, was slightly regarded, and that the framers of it should, in reply, humbly advise him "to take the Covenant himself."^a

That a body also, constituted as the Westminster Assembly was, should draw upon itself the utmost scorn which the haughtiness of a superseded or displaced hierarchy could pour forth, is less to be wondered at than if it had been otherwise. Judging from their leaders, the now humbled party resolved to exhibit very little or no regard at all for truth: even his Majesty is made to assert, "That the far greatest part of those who had been nominated to the present service, were men of neither learning nor reputation;"^b and Laud, with his accustomed assurance, says, "The greater part of them" were "'Brownists' or Independents, or New-England ministers, if not worse;"^c while Clarendon affirms, cavalierly, that "Many of them" were "infamous in their lives and conversation, and most of them of very mean parts in learning, if not of scandalous ignorance, and of no other reputation than of malice to the Church of England."^d It must be owned, there was one among them who had the meanness to act as a spy, and was imprisoned on that account; but Dr. Featly, Chaplain in Ordinary to the King, was so loyal a churchman, that *he* must not be considered either "infamous" or malicious!^e Echard, a no less zealous churchman than his lordship, imitates Clarendon in his slanderous imputation.^f Milton attacked them, it is true, but, unhappily for him, from pique.^g Baxter honoured himself and them, where he remarks that "being not worthy to be one of them myself, I may the more freely speak the truth, even in the face of malice and envy; that, as far as I am able to judge by the information of all history of that kind, and by any other evidences left us, the Christian world, since the days of the apostles, had never a synod of more excellent divines than this and the synod of Dort."^h

In this body, then, of more than a hundred other Divines, were *five* at the least,—Bridge, Burroughes, Goodwin, Nye, and Simpson,—called henceforward "The Dissenting Brethren," whose names will ever stand pre-eminent for their regard for the inalienable rights of conscience; and who contested on behalf of the utmost latitude of religious freedom, and have not only left their joint and separate testimonies, but merited and received the censure of the worst and

^a Whitelock's Memorials, p. 77.

^c His "Troubles. &c." chap. xix. p. 208.

^e Clarendon, bk. vii.

^g In his Hist. of Engl. bk. iii. p. 503. Work's. Ed. 1803, imp. 8vo; and Orme's Baxter, vol. i. p. 89.

^b Hist. Presb. p. 454.

^d Hist. Rebel. bk. v.

^f Echard. Hist. of Engl. vol. ii. p. 416.

^h Baxter's Life. Ed. 1696. pt. i. p. 73.

the commendation of some of the best of opposite parties; whence, it is not to them, "scandalous ignorance" is justly imputable! If it appear, on sufficient authority, that one or all of them were guilty of occasional extravagance, we remark upon it here only by asking, who else was free of the charge in those days of such excitement? An opportunity occurring, one of this redoubtable little band was presently selected to improve the occasion, as our next chapter will show.

CHAP. XLVI.

SIMPSON'S FAST SERMON.—NYE'S EXHORTATION.—THE SCOTS' COMMISSIONERS.—BAILLIE'S DISCLOSURES.—OF MIXT COMMUNION.

THE concluding passage of the foregoing chapter gives notice of "Reformation's Preservation: Opened in a Sermon preached at Westminster, before the Honourable House of Commons, at the late solemn Fast, July 26, 1643. By Sidr.[ach] Simpson, Minister of the Word.—Published by Order of that House. 1643." 4to. pp. 30.

"All the well-affected in the Kingdom," Simpson tells the Commons, in the commencement of his Epistle, "cry unto you, as the woman of Samaria did unto the King, 'help'^a us; or, as the disciples did to Christ, you have 'bid' us come unto you upon the waters, 'save' us,^b for we are sinking! Sinking in our estates, our liberties, our religion; yea, in our hearts and courage too. You have many ways before you for our safety, as the speedy execution of justice on offenders,^c—their 'life' may be our death;^d—the vigorous prosecution of the War; the taking hold of all advantageous opportunities; the wise and active improvement of that spirit God hath yet left in the People, which never was more high and great than now it will be.^e But there is no means like to Reformation: that is a 'defence' [which] cannot be beaten down. . . Some Evils have so subtilly laid themselves between the stones of the Commonwealth; gotten such laws; obtained such favour amongst men, because they are employed so much in Civil matters; that no Word of God alone can destroy them without sharp contentions, unless your hands be on them. Every one may reform himself, but you only can the nation, of those evils; and unless those be removed, *actum est de religione*. The God of heaven give to all and every of you such a spirit as may make you fearless of dangers, faithful to your trust, true to your professed ends, and successful in this work!"

The text is from Isaiah, "For upon all the glory there shall be a defence." Chap. iv. v. 5.

"There are but two things,"—so Simpson opens his discourse,—"that are the desire of all good men in these times; The reformation

^a 2 Kings vi. 26.

^b Matt. xiv. 28, 30.

^c Jere. v. 1; 2 Sam. xxi.

^d 1 Kings xx. 42.

^e "Great dangers raise great courage." Marg.

of Religion; and, The safety and preservation of it and of the Kingdom: and you have both these in the text; Reformation, in the word 'glory;' Preservation, in the other. There are but two works of this day—soul-afflicting, and soul-comforting of ourselves in God; and we have matter for both these in the text too. For mourning, because our 'glory,' Religion, is stained, darkened, assaulted, endangered. It is now with us as it was with the Israelites; our 'Ark'^a is in the field, therefore it is fit every man's hand should be on his loins and his heart be full of trembling. For matter of comfort and encouragement, the text is fitting too; for the words are a promise that none shall hurt us, 'Upon all the glory there shall be a defence.'

"If you look to the former chapter, and the foregoing verse of this chapter, you shall find as bad times foretold as could be... You have, in the latter end of this chapter whereof my text is a part, a double consolation given them: first, that God would, by all their troubles and afflictions, reform them and make them a 'glory:' secondly, that when they are so, there shall no hand touch them; He would be their 'defence.'...

"Glory, in the general, is nothing else but apparent excellency. First; in 'glory,' there must be some Divine excellency, some surpassing good; and therefore it is given unto God—'Thine is the glory.' 'The King's daughter is all glorious within;'^b as 'within' is opposite not to outer but to apparent, she is really 'glorious:' therefore it is called a 'weight of glory.'^c Secondly; this must be evident; and therefore he that offers me 'praise,' saith God, he 'glorifies me:'^d from hence it is attributed to the Church that is reformed, and after the mind of God, 'Glorious things are spoken of thee, thou City of God;'^e 'My soul thirsts... to see thy power and thy glory, as I have seen it in the sanctuary.'^f And because that upon this, one great part of the discourse hangs, I shall therefore, by the way, make it evident that by 'glory' is understood here—a Church reformed: and that from a threefold ground: By considering the context;—Because there is nothing in the Reformation of the Church but what is included in the word 'glory' in the Scripture phrase;—Because there is nothing in 'glory' but what is in a Church reformed.

"First: If you look to the context,—you shall find there a 'branch' coming out of the 'earth;'^g that is, a Church erected when the face of it was spoiled, corrupted, yea undiscernible:^h this is beautiful. The Septuagint render it ἐν βουλῇ, in all parts according to the will of God. It is such, the members whereof are 'holy;' are 'purged,' and that 'by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning.'ⁱ

"Secondly: Whereas there go but two things to the Reformation of the Church, they are both in the word 'glory.' First, there must be all the Ordinances; thus the Ark was called 'glory,'^k and the Ark signified both the Word and Sacraments. Here are, secondly, communicants in these, and they are such as are cleansed and undefiled.^l Here is, thirdly, government; it is said of some, they do despise and not

^a 1 Sam. iv.^b Psal. xlv. 13.^c 2 Cor. iv. 17.^d Psal. l. 23.^e Psal. lxxxvii. 3.^f Psal. lxiii. 1, 2.^g Isai. iv. 2.^h Isai. v. 7; xliv. 3, 4.ⁱ Isai. iv. 4, 5.^k 1 Sam. iv. 21.^l Isai. iv. 3.

respect 'dominions,' or glories, as the word is:^a and the 'glory' that is there spoken of is not Civil but Ecclesiastical; for it is such a kind of despising as Corah and Dathan were guilty of against Moses.^b Now, they opposed Moses not as a Magistrate, but as a Minister and Law-giver unto the Church; and therefore they said, Are not all the people of the Lord 'holy?'^c and not, wise, or valourous, or true-hearted, which are the virtues of a Magistrate! Besides, false-teachers are, for the most part, flatterers of princes; not despisers, as Zedekiah was, and Simon Magus who adored Nero! When you have the Ordinances, then the second thing required to a Reformation is to have them pure, and after God's prescript, without human addition or alteration. Take this for a rule, THE MORE PLAIN GOD'S ORDINANCES ARE, THE MORE POWERFUL: the more there is of man, the less there is of God in them! God tells them they had polluted his Sanctuary;^d that is, made it common: the sacramental 'bread' did them no more good than their own ordinary bread; and the company of the saints, no more than the company and society of men. You have this in the Text too, for here is 'beauty' joined with 'glory,' verse 2nd, and 'beauty' is a native complexion: here is 'glory' joined with purging, 'the spirit of judgment' and 'of burning,' in the verse before my Text: here is holiness 'written' on every soul, verse 3rd; and to be 'holy,' is all one with being set apart to a holy use, and being prepared and fitted for it. Thirdly, take 'glory' in the highest sense that possibly you can, yet then it suits with Reformation. Take glory, for bliss and happiness in heaven; the Scripture so describes a Church as you can scarce know heaven and it asunder: 'You are come to the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, unto an innumerable company of angels, unto the general assembly,^e [and] to the Church of the first-born which are written in heaven, unto God the Judge of all, and unto the spirits of just men made perfect,^f etc.;^g and yet it is apparent it is meant of the Church here, for he saith they 'are come' into it. And if he had only meant it concerning the communion [which] all saints had together, he had not attained his end for which he spake these words; which was to prove, that, in the New Testament there was such a communion as the Old had not in comparison of it. Revelation, 21st chapter, you have there spoken of, a 'City' all whose pavement and gates are jewels; you would think it were heaven, but it is not; for you read, in the 22nd chapter and [12th to the] 15th verses, of a judgment day that doth come after.

"There are three things that make Heaven, or everlasting glory: God's revealing himself; God's full communicating himself; the convolution or turning of all the soul upon God, according unto what he doth reveal of himself: and all these are in the Church Reformed. . . 'The Kingdom of Heaven,' that is, the Church of the New Testament, 'suffers violence, and the violent take it by force:'^h that is, men are so set

^a 2 Pet. ii. 10.^b Jude 8, 11.^c Num. xvi. 3.^d Ezek. xliv. 7.^e Πανηγύρει, ἐκκλησία, σύνοδος πανήγυρις σύναγωγή. Hesych.^f Τετελειωμένων, Phil. iii. 15; Heb. xi. 40. LXX vocant, Τετελεσμένους, μεμυημένους τὰ τῶν δαιμόνων μυστηρία διδασκομένους.^g Heb. xii. 22, 23.^h Matt. xi. 12.

on it as that whatever they pay for it they will enjoy it; so 'violence' signifieth, in the language of the Seventy, in not a few places.^a . . .

" But the main point I would insist on, and for which I have chosen the Text, is this, That 'upon all the glory shall be a Defence:' Reformation will be preservation!

" If you will have the trowel in your hands to build God's house, God will carry the sword in his, for your Defence.^b And in explication of this, I shall do these three things:

" I. Show you what those Evils are, which these that go about Reformation are liable to, that they need protection against.

" II. Show what that Defence is, that you may see whether it be answerable to the trouble and opposition you shall meet with.

" III. Make good this Defence belonging unto Reformation by a reason or two: and I shall go no further than the very chapter wherein my Text is, for all these.

" First: For the Evils, you have three sorts. First, inhuman treacheries; for this verse doth refer both unto Pharaoh's persecution and to the dealings of the Canaanitish Kings with the people of Israel in the Wilderness. Pharaoh's dealing was very treacherous; he bade the people go, gave them their liberty by *proclamation*, but when he had got them at advantage he brought up an army to cut them off: the kings of Canaan dealt very inhumanly, they would neither let the Israelites live quietly by them, nor pass quietly through them; they would neither let them have things for their necessities freely, nor afford them for monies. The Reforming Church will meet with such kind of enemies; yet they are not all, but, secondly, here is, in the 6th verse, heat and cold, that is, such Evils as are intolerable. . . Thirdly, you have also storm and rain spoken of—'a covert from the storm and the rain;' that is, such Evils as are desolating, and come on a sudden before one be prepared for the enduring of them: . . the Church Reformers must look for such like storms; . . and yet against these there shall be 'defence.' . .

" And for this 'Defence,' you have five words in this little chapter to set it forth, 'tabernacle; shadow; place of refuge; a covert;' and, 'Defence,' the word of my Text. . . God speaks often of *his* defending us, because there are but few who think HE is 'Defender of the Faith!' that nail will hardly down, therefore God gives it so many blows. . . God makes the Church his heaven, as it is our means to heaven; 'Go,' saith he, 'and build my house; and I will be glorified in it.'^c But, how can this thing be? you will say. Consider, as there is a double incarnation of Christ, as I may call it; one, proper, in the flesh of his person; another, mystical, in the flesh of his saints, and, therefore, they are called 'Christ';^d and Paul is said to fulfil the sufferings of Christ in his body;^e so you may conceive a double glorification of God: the one, in the beholding of his excellencies in Himself; the other in beholding of Himself in us and in his worship. . . If so be, the Church should suffer ruin, the whole world would come to ruin too;^f for 'the holy' are the props and pillars of it. . . Rev. xi. 7, the 'witnesses' were slain? . . first, they had 'finished their testimony;' . . they could not be overcome, verse 11;

^a Gen. xix. 3; xxxiii. 11; Jud. xix. 7.

^b Rev. iii. 20.

^c Hag. i. 8.

^d 1 Cor. xii. 12.

^e Col. i. 24.

^f Isai. vi. 13. Vide Jun. in loc.

and in the 13th verse, when, as the Popish party think, that now they have none to trouble them, then shall there come an 'earthquake,'—a part of this 'Defence,'—such civil wars, as shall be *their* utter ruin, but the advance of these 'witnesses' again to renown and glory!

"Now we have done altogether with the Explication of the Text, I come to the Application of it: 'Upon all the glory there shall be a defence.'

"First: See the reason why God doth expose his People, the People called by his Name, to so many troubles; why he lets in crosses, calls in enemies, disheartens and disables these that are on His side: they have defiled his 'glory;' and, therefore, he will not defend them! . . . That which is said concerning one ordinance, the Ministry, is true concerning all; if they have lost their 'savour' they are not fit to be kept, but to be thrown out to the dunghill.^a What would you have God to do, my beloved; would you have him defend the People called by his Name, when they are but so 'called,' but are enemies to his 'glory?' Would you have him embrace his Spouse when she hath played the harlot and brought forth to strangers? Would you have him keep his House when the 'devils' haunt it; for so, in 1 Cor. x. 21, that which is not done by the Word, in God's worship, is done 'unto devils?' . . . Whoever they be that corrupt his worship, or are corrupt in his worship, they shame God, they disgrace God, nay, they do as much as they can . . . to take from him his 'glory;' and, therefore, upon them, there shall be no 'defence!'

"Secondly: . . . How hath it been, I beseech you, with us in this Land? The face of Religion was grown wan and pale unto death; her beauty gone, her favour changed; her countenance so smutted, mangled, blurred, that you could scarce know her; her own children were afraid of her, and therefore fled from her, as from her—in the story—that would have put them unto death: her speech was changed, she spake she knew not what; instead of 'minister,' she said 'priest;' for 'sacraments,' 'sacrifice;' for 'table,' 'altar:' her heart was wounded; her fundamental doctrines rased, her worship mingled; original sin denied; the will of man was made supreme over God, and God a servant unto it: Christ's precious blood made common; shed without respect unto any one's good in particular, and, for aught that either Christ or God the Father knew, for all his death no man should be saved by it, for all was left unto man's will, and of a fallible cause there can be no certain and infallible knowledge! . . . And, as you may find in the last Canons, as great penalty put upon one that should not say that Bishops were *jure Divino*, as on him who denied that Christ or the Father were not God: the person[ality] of the Holy Ghost was questioned!

"I might send you the parts of Religion, as the Levite's concubine's quarters were sent abroad unto all the Tribes.^b Give me leave to represent it to you like Tamar, Amnon's sister, with her hands on her head, thrust out of doors, and complaining in the streets with tears,^c thus, They have ravished me, and forced me to their wills and ends; they

^a Luke xiv. 34, 35.

^b Jud. xix. 29.

^c 2 Sam. xiii. 19.

pretended love to me, but intended Popery and Atheism; they have corrupted me, and now they cannot abide me; some of my children have been starved for want of food, some have fallen into diseases because the food they had was not wholesome, and some were forced from me to the howling Desert and Wilderness! Who can now abstain from tears?

“Look on the present corruption: Christ’s body is trodden under feet by swine, in the Sacrament: the Sabbath, profaned: Purity, nicknamed: Reformation, feared more than vassalage. Never, never was the ‘glory’ so near departing as it is now; it is on the threshold, taking the wing. We are at that pass they were, Joel ii. 14, ‘Who can tell whether God will return and leave a blessing behind him?’ And therefore it is time to ‘rend’ your hearts, and ‘turn unto the Lord:’ ver. 13. Religion is agoing; persecuted by Papists, hated by the ignorant, unkindly used by her own friends. It is true, indeed, that [the] people have offered themselves willingly unto Reformation; but David, you know, and the people, did so, long before God built the Temple.^a It is true, there are many righteous among us; never kingdom afforded so many: but yet scarce will Abraham’s ‘ten’ be found, to the number of other profane persons. It is true, there are that humble themselves in dust and ashes; but there are, as you have heard to day,^b that make these days of mourning like days of slaughter:^c and if there were none such, there is a time when mourning, prayers, tears, humbling, will do no good, but merely to men’s own souls, Levit. xxvi. 40—44; if they do ‘accept of the punishment’ and humble themselves, yet ‘the land’ shall lie ‘desolate’ and ‘enjoy her sabbaths.’ The Lord grant this be not our condition; because we have been often threatened and afflicted, but have not returned. The light, it is true, shines very gloriously, and it hath broke out of the clouds that covered it; but the sun shines most brightly a little before it sets! Jerusalem had never better preaching than a little before its ruin; then she had Christ and the apostles! There are many that desire Reformation, it is true: but, look in that place of Rev. xi., when, that the Witness of the ‘measure’ of the ‘temple’ was delivered, they were all slain, ver. 7; and Antichrist came to sit in his throne with greater quietness than ever before, for now all that would trouble them were taken away. What would the misery of this Land be, should Religion perish! Shall I present it to you in the carriage of Phineas’ wife?..^d Micah could not let his idols go but he cried out;^e and can you let the Gospel go, and Christ go, and not do so much? Jesus Christ, who never shed a tear for all he suffered, wept, and could not speak for weeping, when the Gospel was departing: he wept and said, ‘O, that thou hadst known;’ and he could go no further: every word he spake was uttered with a sigh, and pointed with a tear; and he could go no further than ‘O, that thou hadst known, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace!’^f

^a 1 Chron. xxix.

^b From Mr. Covant, according to the Order, thanking the preachers “for the great pains they took in the Sermons they this day preached at the entreaty of this House.”

^c Isai. xxii. 13.

^d 1 Sam. iv. 20—22.

^e Jud. xviii. 23, 24.

^f Luke xix. 42.

Shall the thoughts of it make Christ weep, and not the feeling of it make you?..

“ Thirdly: If upon the ‘glory’ there shall be a ‘defence,’ be not therefore fearful, but believe. Set down this,—your purity is your safety. It is an ordinary word, ‘God defend,’ when any danger or evil is foretold. God will not defend except you be a glory: he will defend when you are. . . Man is against you, God is for you: if so be they be ‘rain,’ you have a ‘covert;’ if they be a ‘storm,’ you have a ‘rock;’ if so be they be ‘heat,’ you have a ‘tabernacle.’^a Shall the lion dread the lamb, and the strong the weak; the giant, the pigmy? Why busy you yourselves about the thing belongs not to you? Look you to the ‘glory;’ God will, to your ‘defence’ and safety! You must provide means; God will find success. . . But you will say, There are many oppositions in the way of Reformation! I answer, Else you needed no ‘defence.’ The ‘wicked’ will always be like a raging sea; they will cast forth ‘mire and dirt’^b when once God doth reduce and bring his people back to such an estate of glory. Truth is brought into the world with pain; it is born in blood: there never was, nor ever shall be a thorough Reformation without troubles; for the most are always the worst, and will not endure it! . . .^c But, when shall this be, that we shall have this ‘defence?’ . . . When you have the ‘glory:’ and let me tell you this, You have made a Reformation when you have made a Resolution, if it be on good grounds: and I will prove it from Scripture too; 2 Chron. xxx. 19, 20, they were not sanctified, ‘according to the purification of the sanctuary,’ who came up unto the passover, but their ‘heart’ was set to be so; and the text saith, God ‘healed’ the land.

“ Fourthly: Set on, I beseech you, on the work of Reformation. You may reform things that are amiss; you have a law of God for it. Ezra v. 2, they ‘began’ to build the Temple; the decree of King Darius came after, in chapter vi. 12. You have a fundamental law for it; a law of nature; it is for your ‘defence:’ ‘Upon all the glory there shall be a defence!’ Reformation is your militia, your army, your bulwarks; your all in all; but be sure when you go about Reformation you make it a ‘glory’ . . . That is very hardly changed afterwards that passeth in Reforming times; as the errors in the first concoction are not mended in the second. The reason of the fall of the ‘house’ lies not so much in the strength of the storm, as because the foundation was not laid well at first.^d You know who it was that said, when he brought in so many Popish things, He intended but only to bring things to the first and primitive Reformation; to King Edward’s time;^e because there was then but a little step gone, in many things, from Popery. And if you would make a thorough Reformation, give me leave, from the Scripture to propound some such things as not being observed may hinder it.

“ First: Take heed of Policy. The Shechemites, to get the estates of the people, would be circumcised; but you know it cost them their lives.^f Policy doth with Religion as Amnon did with Tamar; when it hath its will of it, and served its turn, it thrusts it out of doors:^g Jero-

^a Isai. iv. 6.

^b Isai. lvii. 20, 21.

^c Acts ii. 19, 20; Mal. iv.

^d Matt. vii.

^e “Archb. C., in Star-Chamber.”

^f Gen. xxxiv. 22—26.

^g 2 Sam. xiii. 18.

boam to preserve his kingdom, set up the 'calves:'^a lest the Romans should come in and take the city of Jerusalem,^b the Jews would not receive the Gospel; but they lost both! *In schismatis remedium*;^c to prevent schism, they would have one Bishop over the ministers, and that brought in a Pope; for, by the same reason [that] there ought to be one minister over another; to keep them in order; there ought to be one above all, to order all! . . .

"Policy may be considered two ways: either as an orderer or ranger of things into their proper place and season; and so, Religion is subject unto Policy; because they have both one end, the public defence: or else, Policy may be considered as the lord, and Religion as subordinate; and so it must not be subject to it [Policy]; for Religion is supreme; the end of all things!

"There is a natural worship, which depends on the nature of God; and that a man must do though he die presently; as a man must believe, and a man must acknowledge God, though the point be at the breast,—the dagger be at the heart. But there is, secondly, a worship of God which only doth arise from the will of God; 'instituted worship,' as Divines term it; where the things are not good in themselves, but in order to God's will; as there is nothing in the bread nor in the wine, but what is in ordinary bread, but as the character of God's institution comes on it. In things of this nature, the rule is, 'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.'^d Moses professeth he would not 'sacrifice' among the Egyptians, because they would 'stone' him presently:^e the kingdom was 'established' in David's hands;^f all things were at quiet before he would bring in the Ark.^g In tumultuous times, it is dangerous to alter any thing in matters of Religion, of this sort, more than needs, . . . for it both puts a new title on the quarrel, and divides among the friends, too, and acquaintance of the cause. Not to change, is not so much Policy as Religion; and Religion will never thrive the worse for it. The Gospel tells us there is a leavening time, wherein the leaven is put into the meal before such time as it is kneaded up. The sum is, Policy must not make any thing hinder our *Confession*; Policy may [be], and is, a just ground why men should forbear the *profession* of some things that are good; but that is the first thing.

"Secondly: Would you make a thorough Reformation, take heed to the Laws. Whence is it, that there are so many non-residents that do not 'feed' but starve the flock? We have a law for it. Whence is it, that men are forced to profane the Lord's Supper and to eat and drink their own damnation; but because you have a law, that men of sixteen years of age must come to the Sacrament? A law like the Spaniard's practice, who forced the Indians into the river to be baptised, and then cut their throats; a less evil than this drinking of damnation! Whence came it, that the Ceremonies grew to be like clouds; so many were introduced that the 'glory' could not be seen; but because there was a law, of retaining such as were among the Papists, 'apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty, by some notable signification, whereby he might be edified,' as you may find it in [before]

^a 1 Kings xii. 28.^b John xi. 48.^c Jerome.^d Matt. ix. 13.^e Exod. viii. 26.^f 2 Sam. v. 12.^g 2 Sam. vi.

the Book of Common Prayer? Take heed unto the laws: I had almost said,—if I might crave pardon for the word,—take heed what laws you *make*, in matters of Religion; for if the thing should fall out to be evil,—as what man is there that errs not?—when once it is a law it will be followed: Hosea, v. 11th, they ‘willingly’ followed the ‘commandment,’ of worshipping the calves: the counsels of Jeroboam and his persuasions prevailed much; but ‘the statutes of Omri’ found no opposition.^a Suppose the things be good, a law will be a *ne plus ultra*, . . . and so it may either hinder or make, a future Reformation, harder: not to be contented to do what is enjoined by men of wisdom, that will be accounted unquietness of spirit, at the best; and to go any further than the law, will be esteemed pride, if not disobedience. Moses gave the law of divorce, and you shall find that men stuck so unto that, that Christ’s interpretation of it would not pass.^b Yet that you may not be mistaken, consider that the things of Religion are of several sorts: first, some are such as consist in *indivisible*, which admit of no variation, such as are known to all saints, in one degree or another; such in which there is no possibility of alteration afterward; let me add unto this, such as the common light of all Christians reacheth unto; as the observation of the sabbath, the law, and divers other things: and let me add unto that, such things as do, immediately and properly, concern the Weal-public; these ought to be *established*; there should be such rules for them as all men should go by. But there are [secondly] some other things in Religion whereof a good and godly man may have no knowledge, the knowledge whereof is rather a privilege unto some than a *propriety* unto all saints. Romans xiv., the text saith there, expressly, that these were to be received into the church who held for Jewish ceremonies at that time lawful,—I say, at that time,—though they held them not necessary for salvation. In things of this nature, God is tender; and man should be so too; and yet the Weal-public not be hindered.

“Thirdly: In Reformation, do not make Reason your rule nor line you go by: it is the line of all the Papists. God, say they, hath not less care of his Church in the New than in the Old Testament; there he gave them one High Priest, who should infallibly determine all controversies; and therefore, now there should be one Bishop, who should have the same light and power! You shall never read in Scripture where any man walked after the imaginations of his own heart but, by-and-by, you shall read he did do wickedly. In the point of worship of God, the text saith clearly, ‘Thou shalt not make unto thyself,’^c that is, by thy own wit, anything which may, as an ‘image,’ be like to what God hath appointed, as an image is to the person; anything which may keep God in mind, or keep or stir up affection to him, as a picture doth to him it represents: nay, it reacheth further than that; the greatest reason in the world of any obedience is God’s nature; if he be God that gives being to all things, all things must depend on him by faith; if all things come from him, all things must return to him, as the utmost end; he ought to be served with all a man hath, because all a man hath is from him; this, the nature of God teacheth a man: but

^a Micah vi. 16.^b Matt. xix.^c Exod. xx. 4.

the nature of God is not the reason, but his will is the reason, of his outward worship. It doth not follow, If God be God, he must be served with sacraments, or *such* ministers; but, because he hath set it down, and appointed it. The second Commandment doth forbid not only Reason but all Divine Reason that is not sanctified by institution, in the worship of God: I say, not only all human, but all Divine. Reason may be considered two ways; first, as it is a disposer and placer of all things in their order, and so it belongs to all knowledge and science; secondly, as it imparts a principle of doing anything, and so God's outward worship hath no ground in any Reason, but [in] God's Will.

"Fourthly: If you would make a thorough Reformation, look unto the Ministry. If an angel fall from heaven, he will sweep many together with him. Your own experience hath taught you that no place hath yielded such stubbornness in superstition, so much disobedience and rebellion, as those where the Minister hath either been blind or profane. The only Rule of Reformation, is the Word of God. What, I beseech you, will you do with that, in the worship of God, which will not bring your souls to heaven, but perisheth in the use?^a And that will never bring you to heaven that never came from heaven; for there is no effect of a greater power, or of another nature, than the cause. If so be that Christ hath only told you thus, in the general, 'You shall have Government;' but not told you what Government; he hath not left himself the crown on his head, but put it upon yours! Be you judges, whether is the greater, that saith 'I will have this to be done,' or he that hath power to say 'I will have it done this way or no way; you shall have it done as I please?'"

"Lastly: Would you have Reformation; begin, then, to reform yourselves! God would not have David build his Temple, because he had had his hands in blood; that is, he had shed the blood of Uriah. For, otherwise, in the building of the second Temple, they might fight and build; use the trowel and the sword together.^b There was none might work at the Tabernacle, but he that had a 'spirit.'^c What have 'Tobiahs' and 'Sanballats' to do with such kind of things as these? Certainly that will be accounted but Policy which is done, in Religion, by men who are not holy in their conversation: you have motive enough to this, within my Text: your lives lie in it, for without this, you shall have no 'defence;' your way unto 'glory' lies in it, for, without it, it will not be 'glory,' that is, it will not make you glorious in the eyes of God.

"I shut up all with a word of exhortation. Lift up Prayers unto God, that he would make us a 'glory,' that so He may be our 'defence.' There is that in the Text that would make a dumb man speak, and that would work a heart in him who hath no mind to pray; the very mention of it is alluring, 'glory' and a 'defence;' heaven and safety; God, and all in the world. The words 'Upon the glory there shall be a defence,' are not so much declaratory as promissory; they have bound God so fast he cannot go back. There is nothing doth prevail with God

^a Col. ii. 22.^b Neh. iv. 13—17.^c Exod. xxxv. 30, 31.

so much as Prayer that is for Reformation. In the 18th of Luke, 'I will' go and give her her desire, 'lest she trouble me,' ver. 5, the word that is used there, by the Evangelist, is ὑπωπιάζειν, and ὑπωπία signifieth a 'black eye,' or a 'mark in the face:'^a look! as this reports that a man hath overcome one with whom he either fought or wrestled, so it will bring such a blot on God as he shall never wipe out, if your poor Prayers should be turned into your own bosoms. That Prayer, for Reformation, obtains as soon as ever it is made; and you have a Scripture for that, in the book of Daniel:—as soon as ever—'At the *beginning* of thy supplication, the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee, that thou art greatly beloved.'^b He that will not pray for 'glory' hath no grace! He that will not pray for a 'defence,' he hath no nature alive in him! He that, when he is promised he shall have, will not ask, despiseth, nay, he doth worse than that, he incenseth God unto the greatest wrath against him! Take up, therefore, the words God hath taught you, and speak unto him, 'Lord, spare thy people, and give them not to be a reproach: why should thy enemies say, Where is their God?'^c Where are thy bowels and thy truth, thy goodness and thy power, are they not for everlasting?

"To conclude all: say unto God, in Prayer, and pour it forth with tears, what Ruth did unto her mother-in-law, when she bade her go away, 'Where thou goest, I will go; where thou livest, I will live; where thou diest, I will be buried:'^d So say to God,—Lord, if thou wilt take away Religion and the Gospel, then first take us away: If thou wilt have thy Name blotted out from under heaven, first begin with ours; life will not be worth the having when we may not live with Thee in GLORY! I will assure you this,—and it is in the words of my text,—if so be you will be so set as you will have 'glory,' you shall have 'defence.' You shall be God's 'glory,' and God will be your shelter; for 'upon all the glory there shall be a defence!'"

We shall at this place, present a portion of what proceeded from another of "The Dissenting Brethren," being "An Exhortation made to the Honourable House of Commons, and Reverend Divines of the Assembly, before he read the Covenant, at Margaret's Church, Westminster, Sept. 25th, 1643. By Philip Nye, A.M." Reprinted, 1646. 4to. pp. 6.

"How much this Solemn League and Oath may provoke *other* Reformed churches to a further reformation of themselves; what light and heat it may communicate abroad to other parts of the world, it is only in Him to define to whom is given the 'utmost ends of the earth for his inheritance,' and worketh by his exceeding great power, great things out of as small beginnings. But, however, this I am sure of, it is a way, in all probability, most likely to enable *us* to preserve and defend our religion against our *common enemies*; and, possibly, a more sure foundation this day will be laid for ruining popery and prelacy, the chief of them, than as yet we have been led unto in any age.

"For Popery; it hath been a religion ever dexterous in fencing and mounting itself by association and joint strength. All sorts of profes-

^a Budæus, in Pandect.^b Dan. ix. 23.^c Joel ii. 17.^d Ruth i. 16, 17.

sors, amongst them, are cast into fraternities and brotherhoods; and these orders carefully united, by vow, one with another, and under some more general notion of common dependency. Such states also and kingdoms as they have thus made theirs, they endeavour to improve and secure, by strict combinations and leagues, each to other; witness, of late years, that 'La Sainte Ligue,' The Holy League. It will not be unworthy your consideration, Whether, seeing the preservation of popery hath been by leagues and covenants, God may not make a league or covenant to be the destruction of it! Nay, the very rise of popery seemeth to be after such a manner by kings, that is, kingdoms, assenting and agreeing, perhaps by some joint covenant—the text saith, 'with one mind,' why not, then, with one mouth?—to 'give their power and strength unto the Beast,' and 'make war against the Lamb,' Rev. xvii. 13, 14, where you read, 'the Lamb shall overcome the Beast;' and, possibly, with the same weapons. He is the Lord of lords, and King of kings; he can unite kings and kingdoms, and give them 'one mind' also to destroy 'the whore,' and be her utter ruin. And may not this day's work be a happy beginning of such a blessed expedition?

"Prelacy, another *common enemy* that we covenant and swear against; what hath it been, or what hath the strength of it been, but a subtile combination of clergymen, formed into a policy, or body, of their own invention; framing themselves into subordination and dependency, one upon another, so that the interest of each is improved by all, and a great power, by this means, acquired to themselves; as, by sad experience, we have lately found? The joints and members of this body, you know were knit together by the sacred engagement of an oath; 'The Oath of Canonical Obedience,' as they call it. You remember, also, with what cunning industry they endeavoured, lately, to make this oath and covenant more sure for themselves and their posterity; and intended a more public, solemn, and universal engagement, than, since popery, this cause of theirs was ever maintained or supported by. And, questionless, Ireland and Scotland also must, at last, have been brought into this their holy league, with England. But, blessed be the Lord, and blessed be his good hand, the Parliament, that, from the indignation of their spirits against so horrid a yoke, have dashed out the very brains of this project; and are now, this day, present before the Lord, to take and give possession of this blessed Ordinance, even an oath and covenant as solemn and of as large extent as they [the prelates] intended theirs; uniting these three kingdoms into such a league and happy combination as will, doubtless, preserve us and our reformation against them, though their 'Iniquity,' in the mysteries of it, should still be working^a amongst us. 'Come,' therefore—I speak in the word of the prophet^b—'let us join ourselves to the Lord,' and one to another, and each to all, 'in a perpetual Covenant that shall not be forgotten!'"

Baillie writes, that "the chief aim" of the Covenant was for the propagation of the Scottish church-discipline in England and Ire-

^a 2 Thess. ii. 7.

^b Jer. l. 5.

land; ^a so that Nye could only have approved of it from policy; and Baillie seems to confirm it, where he says, "Mr. Henderson's hopes are not great" of the Assembly's "conformity to us, before our army be in England." ^b The 20th of November, the Scots' Commissioners were admitted to their places in the Assembly, where "no mortal man may enter to see or hear, let be to sit, without an order from both houses of parliament." ^c

"At our first coming, we found them in a very sharp debate anent [concerning] the Office of Doctors. The Independent men whereof there are some ten or eleven in the Synod, many of them very able men, as Thomas Goodwin, Nye, Burroughes, Bridge, Carter, Caryl, Phillips, Sterry, were for the divine institution of a Doctor in every congregation, as well as a Pastor. To these, the others were extremely opposite, and somewhat bitterly, pressing much the simple identity of Pastors and Doctors. Mr. Henderson travelled betwixt them, and drew on a committee for accommodation; in the which, we agreed unanimously upon some six propositions, wherein the absolute necessity of a Doctor in every congregation, and his divine institution, in formal terms, was eschewed; yet where two ministers can be had in one congregation the

^a Let. 37, to William Spang, M.A., at Campvere, a sea-port in the north-east of Walcheren. Nov. 17, 1643. p. 393.

^b P. 395.

^c Let. 39. Dec. 7. p. 398. He adds, "The like of that Assembly I never did see; and, as we hear say, the like was never in England, nor anywhere is shortly like to be. They did sit in Henry VII.'s chapel, in the place of the Convocation; but since the weather grew cold, they did go to [the] Jerusalem chamber, a fair room in the abbey of Westminster. . . On both sides, are stages of seats. . . At the uppermost end, there is a chair set on a frame . . . for the Prolocutor, Dr. Twisse. Before it, on the ground, stand two chairs for the two Mr. Assessors, Dr. Burgess and Mr. White. Before these two chairs, through the length of the room, stands a table, at which sit the two scribes, Mr. Byfield and Mr. Roborough. The house is all well hung, and has a good fire, which is some dainties [rare thing] at London. Foreanent [opposite to] the table, upon the Prolocutor's right hand, there are three or four ranks of forms: on the lowest, we five do sit. Upon the other, at our backs, the members of parliament deputed to the Assembly. On the forms foreanent us, on the Prolocutor's left hand, going from the upper end of the house to the chimney, and at the other end of the house, and backside of the table, till it come about [round] to our seats, are four or five stages of forms, whereupon their Divines sit as they please; albeit commonly they keep the same place. From the chimney to the door, there are no seats, but a void for passage: the lords of parliament use to sit on chairs, in that void, about the fire.

"We meet every day of the week, except Saturday. We sit, commonly, from nine to two or three after noon. The Prolocutor, at the beginning and end, has a short prayer. The man, as the world knows, is very learned in the questions he has studied, and very good, and beloved of all, and highly esteemed; but merely bookish, and not much, as it seems, acquainted with conceived prayer; among the unfittest of all the company for any action, so, after prayer, he sits mute. It was the canny [prudent] conveyance of these who guide most matters for their own interest, to plant such a man, of purpose, in the chair. The one assessor, our good friend Dr. Burgess, a very active and sharp man, supplies, so far as is decent, the Prolocutor's place; the other, our good friend Mr. White, has kept in of the gout since our coming. Ordinarily, there will be present, about three score of their Divines. These are divided into three committees; in one whereof every man is a member. No man is excluded who pleases to come to any of the three. Every committee, as the parliament gives order, in writ, to take any purpose to consideration, takes a portion, and, in their afternoon meeting, prepares matters for the

one is allowed, according to his gift, to apply himself most to teaching, and the other, to exhortation; according to the Scriptures. The next point,—whereon we yet stick,—is Ruling Elders. Many a brave dispute have we had upon them, these ten days. I profess my marvelling at the great learning, quickness, and eloquence, together with the great courtesy and discretion in speaking, of these men. Sundry of the ablest were flat against the institution of any such Officer by divine right, as Dr. Smith, Dr. Temple, Mr. Gataker, Mr. Vines, Mr. Price, Mr. Hall, and many more; beside the Independents, who truly speak much, and exceedingly well! The most of the Synod were in our opinion, and reasoned bravely for it; such as Mr. Seaman, Mr. Walker, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Newcomen, Mr. Young, Mr. Calamy. Sundry times Mr. Henderson, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Gillespie, all three, spoke exceeding well. When all were tired, it came to the question. There was no doubt but we would have carried it by far most voices; yet because the opposites were men very considerable, above all, gracious and learned little Palmer, we agreed upon a committee to satisfy, if it were possible, the dissenters. . . All of them were willing to admit Elders in a prudential way; but this, to us, seemed most dangerous and unhappy, and there-

Assembly; sets down their minds in distinct propositions; backs their propositions with texts of Scripture. After the prayer, Mr. Byfield, the scribe, reads the proposition and Scriptures, whereupon the Assembly debates in a most grave and orderly way. No man is called up to speak but who stands up of his own accord. He speaks so long as he will, without interruption. If two or three stand up at once, then the Divines confusedly call on his name whom they desire to hear first. On whom the loudest and manliest voices call, he speaks. No man speaks to any but to the Prolocutor. They harangue long and very learnedly. They study the question well beforehand, and prepare their speeches; but withal the men are exceeding prompt, and well spoken. I do marvel at the very accurate and extemporal replies that many of them usually make. When, upon every proposition by itself, and on every text of Scripture that is brought to confirm it, every man who will has said his whole mind, and the replies, and duplies, and triplies, are heard; then the most part calls to the question. Byfield the scribe rises from the table, and comes to the Prolocutor's chair, who, from the scribe's book, reads the proposition, and says, 'As many as are in opinion that the question is well stated in the proposition, let them say Aye;' when 'Aye' is heard, he says, 'As many as think otherwise, say No.' If the difference of Ayes and Noes be clear, as usually it is, then the question is ordered by the scribes, and they go on to debate the first Scripture alleged for proof of the proposition. If the sound of Aye and No be near equal, then says the Prolocutor, 'As many as say Aye, stand up:' while they stand, the scribe and others number them in their minds; when they are sat down, the Noes are bidden stand, and they likewise are numbered. This way is clear enough, and saves a great deal of time which we [in Scotland] spend in reading our catalogue. When a question is once ordered, there is no more of that matter; but if a man will deviate, he is quickly taken up by Mr. Assessor, or many others, confusedly crying, 'Speak to order.' No man contradicts another expressly by name, but most discreetly speaks to the Prolocutor, and at most holds on the general, 'The reverend brother, who lately or last spoke on this hand; or that side, above, or below.'

"I thought meet, once for all, to give you a taste of the outward form of their Assembly. They follow the way of their parliament. Much of their way is good, and worthy of our imitation; only their longsomeness is woeful at this time, when their church and kingdom lie under a most lamentable anarchy and confusion. They see the hurt of their length, but cannot get it helped; for being to establish a new platform of worship and discipline to their nation for all time to come, they think they cannot be answerable if, solidly and at leisure, they do not examine every point thereof."

fore was peremptorily rejected. . . This is a point of high consequence ; and upon no other we expect so great difficulty, except alone on Independency ; wherewith we purpose not to meddle in haste, till it please God to advance *our army*, which we expect will much assist our arguments ! However, we are not desperate of some accommodation ; for Goodwin, Borroughes, and Bridge, are men full, as it seems yet, of grace and modesty : if they shall prove otherwise, the body of the Assembly and parliament, city and country, will disclaim them.”^a

Its author could never have intended the foregoing paragraph to be read by his posterity. Independents will continue to regard the contents with peculiar interest. Another passage out of the same long letter to his confidential “Cousin,” discloses the commencement of a species of management which demands terms, to characterize it justly, that feelings of indignation unfit us for using. Other opportunities will, unhappily, require the like exercise of forbearance. “There is shortly to come from the Assembly here, and us Commissioners from Scotland, Letters, in Latin, to all the Reformed churches ; and among the rest, to you of Zealand and Holland. It is my earnest desire, if, by some of the eminent brethren there, you can obtain, in their answers, which I hope will come, some clauses to be inserted of the churches of Holland and Zealand, grave counsel and earnest desire, That, according to our profession in our late Covenant, taken now by both the Assemblies of Scotland and England, we would be careful in our reformation after the Word, to have an eye to that Discipline wherein all the Reformed churches do agree ; and, that we be very diligent to eschew that democratic anarchy and independency of particular congregations, which they know to be opposite to the Word of God, and destructive wholly of that Discipline whereby they and the whole Reformed churches do stand ! If by your dealing, such clauses could be gotten put into your Letters unto us, and in the Letters of the churches of France, Switzerland, Geneva, and others, by the means of your good friends Dr. Rivet, and Spanheim, or some others, it might do us much good : for however we stick, here, on many things, yet the great and dangerous difference will be from the Independent faction, to whom it would be a great dash if—not only we of Scotland, but—they also of Holland, France, and Switzerland, who are alike interested, would give a timeous warning upon the occasion, from this, against the common and great enemies of that Discipline which is common to us all.”^b

As part of the Assembly’s last transactions this year, Baillie informs a reverend brother in Scotland, “We have, after many days’ debate, agreed, *nem. con.*, that beside ministers of the Word, there are other ecclesiastical governors to join with the ministers of the Word in the

^a P. 401.—“The other day, a number of the city and country ministers gave in an earnest and well-penned Supplication to the Assembly, regretting the lamentable confusion of their church, under the present anarchy ; the increase of Anabaptists, Antinomians, and other sectaries ; the boldness of some in the city, and about, in gathering separate congregations ; requesting the Assembly’s intercession with the Parliament for the redress of these evils.” P. 402.

^b P. 406. At the end of this Letter, Baillie writes, “My pamphlets do not sell. I have brought up some of my ‘Laudensium’ and ‘Parallels’ hither, but for no purpose.”

government of the church ; that such are agreeable unto, and warranted by the Word of God, especially Rom. xii. 8 ; 1 Cor. xii. 28. . . This day, the office of Deacon is concluded from the 6th of the Acts. There will be some debate of the perpetuity of his office, and the necessity of it in some cases, as where there are no poor ; and, where the magistrate provides for them ; but that will not much trouble us. . . ^a We have begun a business—very handsomely I trust,—of great consequence. In the time of this anarchy, the divisions of people, do much increase : the Independent party grows ; but the Anabaptists more, and the Antinomians most. The Independents being most able men, and of great credit, fearing no less than banishment from their native country if Presbyteries were erected [!] are watchful that no conclusion be taken for their prejudice. It was my advice, which Mr. Henderson presently applauded, and gave me thanks for it, to eschew a public rupture with the Independents, till we were *more able* ^b for them. As yet, a Presbytery, to this people, is conceived to be a strange monster ! . . In the mean time, we would essay to agree upon the Directory of Worship, wherein we expect no small help from these men to abolish the great idol of England, the Service book ; and to erect, in all the parts of worship, a full conformity to Scotland in all things worthy to be spoken of. . . Ways are in hand, which if God bless, the Independents will either come to us or have very few to follow them. As for the other sects, wise men are in opinion, that God's favour, in this Assembly, will make them evanish." ^c From such auguries, we turn ; in the meanwhile the "army" of Scots will be advancing to do their best toward securing a successful accomplishment.

July 8th, of this year, is the date of a tract intituled, "Satisfaction concerning Mixt Communions : In Answer to the Doubts of some who abstain from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, because Wicked Persons are present." 4to. pp. 14, and bearing the Imprimatur of "John Downname." It was replied to, with the Imprimatur of "John Bachiler, Oct. 5th, 1643;" under the title of "Satisfaction concerning Mixt Communions, Unsatisfactory : Or, Some Short Animadversions upon the most material Passages of a late Book, intituled 'Satisfaction concerning Mixt Communions.'—1 Cor. v. 11 : 'But now I have written unto you, *μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι*, *not to be mixt together*, etc.' Jer. xv. 19 : 'If thou take, etc.' Ezek. xxii. 26 ; xlv. 23 : 'Her Priests have broken my law, and have defiled my holy things : they have put no difference between the holy and profane.'" 4to. pp. 14. "As for my name," says this writer, "I purposely suppress it till the author of the 'Satisfaction' express his." These tracts are noticed here, to show with what tenacity both sides held to their opinions. All we can notice further regarding them, is, that on the advocate having asserted that "There is some honour to Christ in the public profession of His death by those who yet sin grievously in the manner of performance," and having turned his thesis to the point, that "these join with me, then ; not I with them : they profess to join in that true

^a In the next Letter, No. 41, he says, "After, . . we spent two or three sessions upon Widows." P. 410.

^b See back, p. 219, "our army."

^c Let. 40. No date. [Dec. 18th, 1643.] P. 407—409.

service to God that I perform : I do not profess, but disclaim, to join in that sinfulness which they bring :” he at once confuted himself, and needed only to be so responded to, in his very next words, saying, “ They should not do it, if I had authority. Now, I can but be sorry for them, and pray.” P. 5, 6. “ But you want ‘ authority,’ ” says this respondent : “ that’s pity. What are you, I pray you ?—a minister, or pastor, of a congregation, rightly gathered ; and you, rightly called ? Otherwise, what talk you of your ‘ authority, if you had it ? ’ But authority from the congregation or church which you are over, you will have none ! ” P. 5.

CHAP. XLVII.

THE FAMOUS APOLOGETICAL NARRATION.—THE SAINTS’ APOLOGY.

FEW pieces attracted more notice at the time, and few indeed will retain a more prominent importance, than that toward which attention is now directed. Minds in advance of their age invariably gather around the centre of their influence a mixed multitude, whose gaping astonishment, or dull fatuity, or sottish obstinacy, disdain to admit conviction ; and thus would they impede the best interests of themselves and their posterity. The laws of natural and moral instinct, the irrepressible power of reason, nevertheless, operate the accomplishment of the purposes of Providence, and continue their onward motions quietly but surely—slowly but effectually ; and the films of ignorance, prejudice, and selfishness, can no longer shut out even the faintest glimmerings, much less obstruct the broad effulgence of Truth. There are others besides “ swine,”^a before or among whom it may be unwise or unseasonable to throw what is precious ; and such others have also shown the like propensity to “ trample ” and to “ rend.” Wherein these remarks are justifiable from the contents of this chapter, their special application is left to be appropriated by whomsoever shall feel competent to the adventure : but whatever the policy pursued by those who assisted in selecting the persons who constituted the Assembly of Divines, we are ourselves peculiarly interested in the five names contained in the tract intitled “ An Apologetical Narration Humbly submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament. By Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughes, William Bridge.—1643.” 4to. pp. 31.

Returned from their abodes in exile, these Ministers were “ now members of the Assembly of Divines.” Their joint production^b bears the *imprimatur* of “ Charles Herle,” himself a member of that distinguished body, and who had, as we have shown, but very recently

^a Matt. vii. 6.

^b It “ came forth in the month of December.” Edwards, *Gangræna*. Pt. ii. p. 50.

attacked, in print, the principle of "Independency;"^a but who now, in his character of a Licensor of the Press, is so respectful in the terms he employs toward the Apologists in particular, that for the credit of himself and them, we record his words at length: "This 'Apologetical Narration' of our reverend and dear brethren, the learned authors of it, is so full of peaceableness, modesty, and candour; and, withal, at this time, so seasonably needful, as well towards the vindication of the Protestant party in general from the aspersions of incommunicableness within itself, and incompatibleness with Magistracy, as of themselves in particular, both against misreportings from without, and some possible mistakings from within too; that, however, for mine own part, I have appeared on and do still incline to the Presbyterial way of church-government, yet do I think it every way fit for the Press."

These Apologists commence their Narration by asserting, rather indistinctly, that awakened with "a sudden and unexpected noise... we are enforced to anticipate a little, that discovery of ourselves which, otherwise, we resolved to have left to time... And now we shall begin to make some appearance into public light, unto whose view and judgments should we, that have hitherto lain under so dark a cloud of manifold misapprehensions, at first present ourselves, but the Supreme Judicatory of this kingdom?"

They remind the Legislature that "the most, if not all of us, had, ten years since,—some more, some less,—several settled stations in the ministry, in places of public use in the Church." The "evil" of the corruptions in that Church took hold, they say, upon their consciences, long before it did upon the consciences of some others of their brethren. At first, they saw only "the dark part;" the evil of the "superstitions" adjoined to the worship of God; which was enough to bring upon them "violence and persecution, or an exile to avoid it;" which latter, they say, also, "we did the rather choose."

While in their condition of expatriation, they commenced inquiring into "the light part;" the "positive part of church worship and government"—what were the first apostolic directions, pattern, and examples, of "those primitive churches recorded in the New Testament?" That, they subjoin, was the sacred "pillar of fire" by which they were guided! "And," they proceed, "we had, of all men, the greatest reason to be true to our own consciences in what we should embrace, seeing it was for our consciences that we were deprived, at once, of whatever was dear to us. *We* had no new commonwealths to rear, to frame church-government unto,—whereof any one piece might stand in the other's light,—to cause the least variation by us from the primitive pattern. *We* had no state ends, or political interests to comply with: no kingdoms in our eye to subdue unto our mould; which yet will be co-existent with the peace of any form of civil government on earth; no preferment, or worldly respects, to shape our opinions for. *We* had nothing else to do but simply, and singly, to consider how to worship God acceptably, and so most according to his Word."^b

^a See back, p. 166.

^b The words in Italics in these passages are not so in the original; but they seem to require the distinction.

They remark, in continuation, that they were not engaged by education, or otherwise, to any other of the Reformed Churches. "And although we consulted, with reverence, what they hold forth, both in their writings and practice, yet we could not but suppose that they might not see into all things about worship and government; their intentions being most spent—as also, of our first Reformers in England,—upon the reformation in Doctrine. . . And we had, with many others, observed that although the exercise of that government had been accompanied with more peace, yet the practical part, 'the power of godliness,'^a and the profession thereof, with difference from carnal and formal Christians, had not been advanced and held forth among them as in this our own island; as themselves have generally acknowledged.

"We had the advantage" they continue, "of all that light which the conflicts of our own divines—the good old Nonconformists,—had struck forth in their times; and the draughts of Discipline which they had drawn. . . We had, likewise, the fatal miscarriages and shipwrecks of the 'Separation'—whom ye call 'Brownists,'—as landmarks to forewarn us of those rocks and shelves which they ran upon: which also did put us upon an inquiry into the principles that might be the causes of their divisions.

"Last of all, We had the later example of the ways and practices—and those improved to a better edition, and greater refinement, by all the forementioned helps,—of those multitudes of godly men of our own nation—almost to the number of another nation!—and among them, some as holy and judicious divines as this kingdom hath bred; whose sincerity in their way, hath been testified. . . by the greatest undertaking, but that of our father Abraham, out of his own country, and his seed after him; a transplanting themselves, many thousand miles distance, and that by sea, into a wilderness; merely to worship God more purely."

"We resolved," they say afterward, "not to take up our religion by or from any party; and yet to approve and hold fast whatsoever is good in any, though never so much differing from us; yea, opposite unto us.

"And for our own Congregations, we mean of England; in which, through the grace of Christ, we were converted, and exercised our ministries long, to the conversion of many others; we have this sincere profession to make before God and all the world, That all that conscience of the defilements we conceived to cleave to the true worship of God in them, or of the unwarranted power in church-governors exercised therein, did never work in any of us, any other thought, much less opinion, but that multitudes of the assemblies and parochial congregations thereof, were 'the true churches and body of Christ; and the ministry thereof, a true ministry:' much less did it ever enter into our hearts to judge them 'antichristian.' We saw, and cannot but see, that, by the same reason, the churches abroad, in Scotland, Holland, etc., though more reformed, yet, for their mixture, must be, in like manner, judged no churches also! . . We always have professed . . and when ourselves had least, yea, no hopes of ever so much as visiting our own land

^a 2 Tim. iii. 5.

again in peace, and safety to our persons, That we both did, and would, hold a 'communion' with them as the churches of Christ. . . What we have, since our return, publicly and avowedly made declaration of to this purpose, many hundreds can witness; and some of our brethren, in their printed books, candidly do testify for us.^a And, as we always held this respect unto our own churches in this kingdom, so we received, and were entertained with the like, from those Reformed Churches abroad among whom we were cast to live; . . granting, to some of us, their own churches or public places for worship, to assemble in . . at differing hours the same day; as, likewise, the privilege of ringing a public bell: . . and, others of us, found such acceptance with them, that . . they allowed a full and liberal maintenance, annually, for our ministers; yea, and constantly, also, wine for our communions. And then, we, again, on our parts . . received also some of the members of their churches . . unto communion in the sacraments and other ordinances."

They next, commence a brief relation of "the way and practices" of their churches. Their Worship was composed of "public and solemn prayers 'for kings, and all in authority,'^b etc.; the reading of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; exposition of them, as occasion was; and, constant preaching of the Word; the administration of the two Sacraments, baptism to infants, and the Lord's supper; singing of psalms; collections for the poor, etc. every Lord's-day."

"For Officers and public rulers in the church, we set up no other but the very same which the Reformed Churches judge necessary and sufficient, and as instituted by Christ and his apostles, for the perpetual government of his Church; that is, pastors, teachers, ruling-elders—with us, not lay, but ecclesiastic persons separated to that service,—and, deacons."

"And for the matter of Government and Censures of the church, we had, nor executed, any other but what all acknowledge; namely, admonition; and excommunication, upon obstinacy and impenitency."

For their guidance, or "directions," they adopted "three principles, more especially:"—"First, The supreme rule, without us, was the primitive pattern and example of the churches erected by the apostles. . . The fulness of the Scriptures; that there is therein a complete sufficiency, as to make 'the man of God perfect';^c so also, to make the churches of God perfect! Mere circumstances we except, or, what rules the law of nature doth in common dictate. . . Not daring to eke out what was defective in our light, in matters Divine, with human prudence,—the fatal error to Reformation,—lest by sewing any piece of the 'old garment' unto the 'new,' we should make the rent 'worse'. . .^d A second principle . . . was, Not to make our present judgment and practice a binding law unto ourselves for the future: . . which principle we wish were,—next to that most supreme, namely, To be, in all things, guided by the perfect Will of God,—enacted as the most sacred law of all other, in the midst of all other laws and 'canons ecclesiastical' in Christian states and churches throughout the world! Thirdly . . whereas one great controversy of these times, is about the 'qualification' of the

^a "The Rise, Growth, and Danger of Socinianism. By Francis Cheynell. Lond. 1643." 4to.

^b 1 Tim. ii. 2.

^c 2 Tim. iii. 17.

^d Mar. ii. 21.

members of churches ; and, the promiscuous receiving, and mixture of good and bad. Therein, we chose the better part ; and, to be sure, received in none but such as all the churches in the world would, by the balance of the Sanctuary, acknowledge faithful. . . The rules which we gave up our judgments unto, to judge those we received in amongst us by, were of that latitude as would take in any member of Christ ; the meanest, in whom there may be supposed to be the least of Christ ; and, indeed, such, and no other, as all the godly in this kingdom carry in their bosoms to judge others by. We took measure of no man's holiness by his opinion ; whether concurring with us, or adverse unto us. And churches [any church] made up of such, we were sure no Protestant could but approve of, as touching the members of it, to be a true church, with which communion might be held."

Concerning the great Ordinance of Public-prayer, and the Liturgy of the Church, they say, "Whereas there is this great controversy upon it—About the 'lawfulness' of set Forms prescribed ;—we practised, without condemning others, what all sides do allow, and themselves do practise also, That the Public-prayers in our assemblies should be framed by the meditation and study of our own ministers, out of their own gifts,—the fruits of Christ's ascension,—as well as their Sermons use to be. This we were sure, all allowed of ; though they superadded the other."

"So, likewise," they proceed, "For the Government and Discipline, in the churches : . . we could not but imagine, That the first churches, planted by the apostles, were, ordinarily, of no more in one city, at first, than might make up one entire congregation, ruled by their own elders that also preached unto them. For that in every city where they came, the number of converts did or should arise to such a multitude as to make several and sundry congregations ; or that the apostles should stay the setting up of any churches at all, until they rose to such a numerous multiplication as might make such a Presbyterial combination, we did not imagine ! . . And we judged, That all those precepts, 'obey your elders,' and 'them that are over you,' were . . meant of the pastors and teachers, and other elders, that were set over them in each particular congregation respectively ; and to be as certainly the intendment of the Holy Ghost as in those like commands, 'wives obey your own husbands,' 'servants, your own governors,' to be meant of their several families, respectively!"

"We could not, therefore, but judge it a safe and an allowed way, to retain the Government of our several Congregations, for matter of Discipline, within themselves ; to be exercised by their own Elders ; whereof we had, for the most part of the time we were abroad, three at least in each Congregation, whom we were subject to. Yet not claiming to ourselves an 'independent power' in every Congregation, to give account, or be subject to none others ; but only a full and entire power complete within ourselves, until we should be challenged to err grossly : such as Corporations enjoy ; who have the power and privilege to pass sentence for life and death within themselves, and yet are accountable to the State they live in. But that it should be the institution of Christ, or his apostles, that the combination of the elders of many churches

should be the first complete and entire seat of church power over each congregation so combined; or, that they could challenge and assume that authority over those churches they feed and teach not ordinarily, by virtue of those forementioned apostolical precepts, was, to us, a question, and judged to be an additament unto the other. . . . And, certainly, of all other, the challenge of all spiritual power from Christ, had need have a clear patent to show for it."

"And whereas the common prejudice and exception laid into all men's thoughts against us and our opinions is, That in such a Congregational Government, thus entire within itself, there is no allowed sufficient remedy for miscarriages; . . . no relief for wrongful sentences; . . . no room for complaints; no powerful, or effectual means to reduce a church, or churches, that fall into heresy, schism, etc. . . . we have . . . wherewith to vindicate ourselves and way, in this particular." Here the Apologists commence an account of their method of proceeding in a case of deposition of a minister; wherein they proffered their advice in conformity with that apostolic command, that churches, as well as individual members, are bound to "give no offence, neither to Jew, nor Gentile, nor to the *churches* of God"^a they live amongst. "So that," they add, "in all cases of such offence or difference, by the obligation of the common law of 'communion of churches,' and for the 'vindication of the glory of Christ,' which in common they hold forth, the church, or churches, challenged to offend, or differ, are to submit themselves . . . to the most full and open trial and examination by other, neighbour, churches offended thereat, of whatever hath given the offence. And, further, that, by virtue of the same and like law, of not partaking in 'other men's sins,'^b the churches offended may and ought, upon the impenitency of those churches . . . to pronounce that heavy sentence against them, of withdrawing, and renouncing, all Christian communion with them, until they do repent; and, further, to declare and protest this, with the causes thereof, to all other churches of Christ, that they may do the like."

Further than the above, what "authority, or proceedings purely 'ecclesiastical,' of one or many sister churches towards another whole church, or churches, offending; either the Scriptures do hold forth, or can rationally be put in execution, without the Magistrates' interposing power of another nature;" they profess not to see. They argue, however, against the principle of "an 'authoritative' power in the greater part of churches combined," that "unless it do take hold of men's consciences, and be received amongst all churches, the offending churches will slight all such 'excommunications' as much as they may be supposed to do our way of protestation, and sentence of 'non-communion.'" On the other side, they say, "Let this way of ours be but as strongly entertained, as that which is the way and command of Christ, and upon all occasions, be heedfully put in execution; it will awe men's consciences as much, and produce the same effects." Still, so far from disclaiming subjection to rightful "authority," they affirm "we give as much, and, as we think, more, than the principles of the Presbyterian Government will suffer them to yield;" which "power" of Magistrates, if it "do but

^a 1 Cor. x. 32.

^b 1 Tim. v. 22.

assist and back the sentence of other churches denouncing this 'non-communion' against churches miscarrying. . . then without all controversy, this our way of church proceeding will be every way as effectual as their other can be supposed to be ; and, we are sure, more brotherly, and more suited to that liberty and equality Christ hath endowed his churches with : but without the Magistrates' interposing their authority, their way of proceeding will be as ineffectual as ours ; and more liable to contempt, by how much it is pretended to be more 'authoritative,' and to inflict a more dreadful punishment,^a which carnal spirits are seldom sensible of."

How much soever, after all, these Apologists had searched into the original of church power ; and, how meritorious and successful soever they had been in reviewing and revising "the fatal miscarriages and shipwrecks of the 'Separation ;'" yet in steering clear of the rock Scylla, that they were drawn into the vortex of Charybdis is evinced in the importance they attach to this singular passage—"That it was the most to be abhorred maxim that any Religion hath ever made profession of, and, therefore, of all other, the most contradictory and dishonourable unto that of Christianity, That a single and particular society of men, professing the name of Christ, and pretending to be endowed with a power from Christ to judge them that are of the same body and society within themselves ; should further arrogate unto themselves an exemption from giving account to, or being censurable by any other, either Christian Magistrates above them, or neighbour churches about them." This, they adduce in proof that, as they say ; "so far were our judgments from that 'independent' liberty that is imputed to us, then, when we had least dependency on this kingdom, or so much as hopes ever to abide therein in peace." We cannot but remark, that the terms "most contradictory, and dishonourable," are not in our own judgment, justly applicable to the case to which they are applied by the Apologists : for, how can it follow necessarily, that because any church chooses to restrict its authority within its own boundary, that therefore any other church or churches, or what else soever is extrinsic should claim to have an undisputed and undefined jurisdiction extending over a church so restricted ? If such church be large and reputed, for instance, to be heterodox, it may be that ostensible interference will only provoke immitigable hostility, and thence promote disunion among those churches which so interfere : and, again, if any church be reputed to be defiled by countenancing immorality, and, perhaps, retaining in membership a notoriously wicked person, active interference, or remonstrance, becomes extremely hazardous, from the danger incident to human nature, of partisanship arising from clashing interests, personal and family. The ordinary rules of human prudence may suggest the wisest course to be pursued to prevent much evil ; but the apostolic injunction extends to communities, "Let not your good be evil spoken of ;"^b and our Divine Master has graciously bestowed a corrective and salutary principle, in perfect harmony with the extension

^a "A delivering of whole churches and their elders offending 'unto Satan ;' for which we know no warrant in the Scriptures, that churches should have such a power over other churches."

^b Rom. xiv. 16.

and purity of his kingdom, "Let *your* light so shine before men that they may see *your* good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." ^a 'The Magistrates' province extending over all persons civilly, none can, under any pretence, be exempt from accountability, and submission to their lawful authority: yet Civil Governors have certainly less to apprehend from religious societies, or churches, formed on the principle of the Independents, than from a compacted ecclesiastical corporation extending over the empire, and with capabilities of erecting itself into a hostile "imperium in imperio;" exemplified, signally, in the instance of the Church of England under James II. But, reverting to the Apologists, it is not to be wondered at, that their minds should be influenced to favour the high claims of prerogative: later times have discovered intolerance nearly disarmed; and the just limits of a rightful sway are defined and preserved with more accuracy than was ever projected in their age. If the "exemption" which they so strongly declaimed against were to be abandoned, and not rather qualified, where, we ask, would then be the evil of acknowledging the supremacy of the same temporal head over a church, or churches, as over the State? For an evil, we contend, that must be, which directly contravenes Christ's supremacy, who has himself said "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon!" ^b

The Apologists tell the Parliament that "when it pleased God to bring us poor Exiles back again, in these revolutions of the times," they then found "godly learned brethren,"—meaning the Puritans or Presbyterians "to differ" from them in some things wherein they "judge the Calvinian Reformed Churches, of the first Reformation from out of Popery, to stand in need of a further Reformation themselves:" the "founders" of that first Reformation "not having," as they justly remark, "apostolic infallibility, might not be fully perfect the first day." They found also that prejudices had preceded them on their return; for besides "a cloud of mistakes and misapprehensions," they were calumniated as "schismatics," which, since "the former ecclesiastical government of this church established" was then suppressed,—who, they inquire, "is not involved" in the calumny "as well as we?" But what seemed to give them most particular concern, they represent again in these remarkable words, "That proud and insolent title of 'Independency,' was affixed unto us as our claim; the very sound of which conveys to all men's apprehensions the challenge of an exemption of all churches from all subjection and dependence, or rather a trumpet of defiance against whatever power, spiritual or civil: which we do abhor and detest. Or else, the odious name of 'Brownism,' together with all their opinions, as they have stated and maintained them, must needs be owned by us: although, upon the very first declaring our judgments in the chief and fundamental point of all Church Discipline, and likewise since, it hath been acknowledged that we differ much from them!" This has brought us to that noticeable passage in which they propounded and thus publicly professed their relative position with regard to extreme parties. "We believe," say they, "the truth to lie and consist in a *middle way* betwixt that which is falsely charged on us, 'Brownism;' and that which is the con-

^a Matt. v. 16.

^b Matt. vi. 24.

tention of these times, the 'authoritative Presbyterian Government' in all the subordinations and proceedings of it." ^a

They affirm, that since their return, had it been their disposition they had had "manifold advantages" to make and increase a party. "We found the spirits of the people of this Kingdom that profess or pretend to the power of godliness,—they finding themselves to be so much at liberty, and new come out of bondage,—ready to take any impressions, and to be cast into any mould that hath but the appearance of a stricter way. And we found that many of those mists that had gathered about us, or were rather cast upon our persons, in our absence, began, by our presence again, and the blessing of God upon us, in a great measure to scatter and vanish, without speaking a word for ourselves or Cause." Still they make strong allusion to the conduct of the then predominant party having made "incitements to this State not to allow" them the peaceable practices of their consciences, which the Reformed Churches abroad allowed them; and these incitements they complain were "edged with calumnies, and reproaches cast upon our persons in print; and all these heightened with this further prejudice and provocation, That this our silence was interpreted, that we were either ashamed of our opinions, or able to say little for them; whenas, on the other side, besides all other advantages, books have been written by men of much worth, learning, and authority, with moderation and strength, to prepossess the people's minds against what are supposed our tenets... We have, and are yet, resolved to bear all this with a quiet and a strong patience—in the strength of which we now speak, or rather sigh forth this little,—referring.. what we conceive to be God's truth therein, to the due and orderly agitation of this Assembly whereof both Houses were pleased to make us members."

Notwithstanding that the Apologists could have taken other courses, which, say they, "we have had, these three years, opportunity to have done," they persisted in "the orderly and peaceable way of searching out truths, and reforming the churches of Christ," having, "in a conscientious regard" thereto, "adventured ourselves upon this way of God, wisely assumed by the prudence of the State," and that amidst all sorts of disadvantages "of number, abilities of learning, authority, [and] the stream of public interest."

In all matters of Doctrine, they professed an agreement, or they would never have exposed themselves "to this trial and hazard of discovery in this Assembly; the mixture of whose spirits, the quickness of whose judgments,—intent enough upon us,—and variety of debates.. would be sure soon to find us out, if we nourished any monsters or serpents of opinions lurking in our bosoms... And in matters of Discipline, we are so far from holding up the differences that occur, or making the breaches greater or wider, that we endeavour, upon all such occasions, to grant and yield,—as all may see, and cannot but testify for us,—to the utmost latitude of our light and consciences!"

They declare, in their concluding paragraph, that though they have

^a The reference to this passage is accompanied, by Neal, with a representation of particulars, brought together; but conveying an imperfect idea of the real opinions espoused by these Apologists. See "Hist. Puritans." vol. iii. chap. iv.

thus "rendered a clear and true account" of their ways and spirits hitherto, they reserve, nevertheless, a more exact and scholastic relation of their judgments about church government "unto the more proper season and opportunity of this Assembly, and that liberty given by both Honourable Houses, in matters of dissent; or, as necessity shall require, to a more public way of stating and asserting them. In the meantime," they say, "from this brief historical relation of our practices, there may a true estimate be taken of our opinions in difference; which being instanced in, and set out by practices, is the most real and least collusive way, and carries its own evidence with it." They remark, too, that they "differ" as little from their "*brethren*" the Non-conformists, "yea, far less than *they* do from what *themselves* were three years past; or than the generality of this kingdom [differs] from itself, of late." And they call upon the Parliament to consider them "as those who, in these former times, for many years suffered, even to exile, for what the kingdom itself now suffers in the endeavour to cast out;" and who "in these present times, and since the change of them, have endured... the opposition and reproach of good men, even to the threatening of another banishment!" Their final entreaty is, to be allowed to obtain "a subsistence, be it the poorest and meanest," in their native land; with "a latitude to some lesser differences, with peaceableness, as not knowing where else with safety, health, and livelihood, to set our feet on earth."

We complete this chapter with "The Saints' Apology: Or, A Vindication of the Churches which endeavour after a Pure Communion, from the odious names of 'Brownists' and 'Separatists.' In a Letter sent to an eminent Divine of the Assembly; showing that they separate not from True Churches; but keep themselves free from other men's sins, in separating from the Corruptions only which such Churches maintain in their External Communion, and from that yoke of bondage which they subject themselves unto under Prelates, and Human Devices.—Printed with Order. 1644." 4to. pp. 15.

The publisher states, under the signature "S.," that this Letter "was written a year or two before this Parliament began," and that he "thought fit to put it forth to public view, hoping some may receive such light from it as may rectify their judgments, or at least make them more charitable to their brethren." The Letter itself opens thus:—

"SIR.—For the satisfaction of your desire expressed in the Letter, I will first lay down some grounds which I conceive to be agreeable to truth, and thereupon give you the reason of my judgment and practice.

"First: I conceive a visible, ministering, church, under the Gospel, to be a company of believers joining themselves together, in the Name of Christ, for the enjoyment of such ordinances, and exercise of such spiritual government as the Lord hath appointed, for His worship and honour, and their mutual edification... If the truth of anything herein be questioned, that must stand or fall according to Scripture. I call it a 'visible, ministering,' church; to distinguish it from that 'universal' which can be neither, except we will admit the Pope,—or some image

of him, some such human device,—to be it virtually : always to exist, visibly, for the performance of such duties as Christ hath enjoined his churches to perform upon all occasions of ‘offence’ or otherwise : and yet that will not serve, neither ; except *courts* and *officers* be allowed, even to the *apparitors*, as hands, in all places, to supply defects in this way ! I add, ‘under the Gospel,’ because the constitution, under the Law, was national ; the officers, ordinances, and places of worship, all fitted to such a frame, and typical : which, under the Gospel, was changed, as appeareth both by Christ’s institution, Matt. xviii., and all the apostles’ practice, throughout, in all places, who best understood our Saviour’s intention and meaning. . .

“ Secondly : The *matter* of this church, is a company of saints ; such, of whom, as the apostle, so the church that admits them or joins with them, ought to think it meet to judge of every one of them, that Christ ‘hath begun a good work’ in them, and ‘will finish it.’^a The apostles always style them ‘saints,’ and ‘faithful brethren ;’ or ‘the church,’ of such a place, ‘which is in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ ;’ saints by calling ; sanctified in Christ Jesus ; the church elected together with them ; and such like titles, applicable only unto men sanctified : that they ought to be such in profession, will not be denied ; that they ought to be what they profess, is as evident. The *power* of the church, and the exercise of that power commanded by our Saviour, is for this end, that ‘offences’ may be taken away when men shall appear to be other than they make profession to be ; and that they [‘offences’] may be prevented, so far as man can judge, by keeping out ‘false brethren,’ that they creep not in ‘privily.’ The unruly are to be admonished ; and if upon admonition they will not reform, Christ directeth what course shall be taken with them ; and he who is to be cast out, when he is known, ought not to be admitted, could he be known to be other than a saint by the church, before he was received.

“ Thirdly : The *form* of such a visible church, I conceive to be the relation which, by their mutual consent, is raised between them for spiritual ends ; by which it is that they have power of jurisdiction, and may and ought to ‘judge’ those ‘that are within :’^b which jurisdiction, no man can, lawfully, be subjected unto but by his own agreement. The superiority of jurisdiction, either in things spiritual or temporal,—if it be not natural, as the paternal,—must be voluntarily subjected unto, or it is usurped and tyrannical : therefore, to raise this relation, which gives a power of judging, there must be a voluntary submission of themselves one to another testified by some act, whether you will call it a covenant, or consent, or agreement, between fit members for such ends.

“ This consent and agreement, ought to be explicit, for the well-being, but not necessarily to the being, of a true church ; for it may be implied by such constant and frequent acts of communion performed by a company of saints, joined together by cohabitation in towns and villages, as that the falling in of their spirits into this brotherly fellow-

^a Phil. i. 6.^b 1 Cor. v. 12.

ship and communion in things spiritual, is acted unto the true being of it: but for the draught of the clear and full expression thereof among themselves; the relation it raises, the power it gives them one over another; the duty it obligeth them unto in the exercise of that power, is obscurely and little apprehended, and less practised. This, I conceive to be the present state of most of the churches in this kingdom, which, although they be true churches,—I do not mean it of the whole towns,—yet being too ignorant wherein that [relation] consisteth, and what power and privilege they have and ought to exercise by it, they suffer themselves, by usurpers, to be deprived of the exercise of this power; and, thereby, a mixed multitude press in among them, to their own hardening; to the churches' leavening, contracting guilt through neglect of their duty to separate the vile from the precious, suffering sin to fret like a gangrene; and to the great dishonour of Christ, who, hereby, is held forth, through the negligence of the church, to be a Head unto such members, in the eye of the world! There is, besides, through the same usurpation, a yoke of bondage cast upon the churches by the imposition of many human devices both upon officers and members, full of tyranny and superstition; the suffering whereof, will cause the Lord to have many things against them, but doth not unchurch them, since many wants and many corruptions may stand with the being of a true church; as all experience sheweth.

“I expect, hereupon, to be demanded, What reasons I can give, why Separation should be made from such churches which are acknowledged to be true churches, although with many wants and corruptions? In answering whereof, I shall give you an account of that [which] I undertook.

“And, first; I say this word ‘Separation’ is no such bugbear as many would make the world and themselves believe; who,—hand over head, without differencing things or persons, or understanding that whereof they affirm,—take it up and cast it abroad with as little charity as learning! ‘Separation,’ whereof we speak, is either from the communion of the invisible church, ‘the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven,’^a or from this or that particular visible church’s communion: The first, cannot be made but by denying the faith; for the requisites unto that communion are faith and love: and this is a ‘separation’ as fearful and terrible as they would or can make ‘separation’ to be. The second, consisteth in refusing to join in the external communion of this or that particular church; as in their liturgies, public prayers, participation of sacraments: and this ‘separation,’ upon due cause, may be made without any more danger or ill consequences than there is in keeping ourselves free from partaking with other men in their sins;^b and being made, it neither separates those men who made it, from the communion of the catholic church, nor from internal communion with the saints of that particular visible church, as they are saints and members of the catholic church, but only from the corruptions of their external communion, which they hold in that visible church whereof they are. Luther made a ‘separa-

^a Heb. xii. 23.

^b Eph. v. 7.

tion' from the external communion of all the churches in the world; and he, with those that adhered to his doctrine in that 'separation,' did constitute churches more pure, both in regard of their constitution and exercise of external communion; yet none but Papists, or such in our times as linger after Popery, and would be glad of a captain to lead them back again into Egypt, will accuse him to have made a schism, and brand him with the odious name of a schismatic: for he separated not from believers as believers, but from those corruptions which were universally spread over all in the external communion that then was held in the Christian world. And this he was bound to do, and others with him who believed his doctrine, if they would keep themselves pure from the guilt of those common corruptions.

"In the second place, I answer, that there is a necessity laid upon many, and it is, as I conceive, the duty of all that have light to see it, to separate themselves from holding external communion with many churches, here in England, although acknowledged true churches; and that, for these reasons. First, because such things are required of them to be performed, if they will hold external communion, as they cannot practise without sin: Secondly, if they might be free for their own practice, yet they cannot perform that duty which, by Christ's command, lieth upon them, as members of a visible church, to perform and fulfil, that they may not contract guilt and be leavened by the sinful practises of fellow members. For the first, I will instance in those things which, being retained in these churches and enjoined upon all, have been, ever since the Reformation of religion, opposed and witnessed against by the greatest lights of this later age, both strangers and of our own nation; yea, and cast out by the purest, if not by all other Reformed churches; abjured as antichristian, by some; only these, which hang between heaven and earth, and are still moving downward towards the centre of their old superstitions, do not only retain them, but will suffer none to join in external communion with them, except they will approve and practise what they do! These are the usurping Hierarchy, and the Popish ceremonies, the devices of men; the ornaments and dress of the Romish Whore, thought decent and fittest for to adorn God's worship; not, in my judgment, at any time, *tolerabiles ineptiæ*, in their use here, as one calls the [English] ceremonies,^a but at this time much less 'tolerable,' as they are maintained and pressed; the one, not by commission from the magistrate, but as a superior degree of ministry by Divine institution, not esteemed to be *jure humano*; the other, not as idle, empty ceremonies, but serving to teach, and express the inward affections of the heart: the 'white linen;' what can that express, but angelical purity! the 'cross,' hath its expression; and what it teacheth is given unto it, constancy in confession of the faith! 'kneeling,' in the act of receiving, urged as a gesture of more reverence, and fitter for that ordinance, than that which our Saviour used and thought congruous to it! Unto these, I will add that composition of a Divine public worship, by men, which they call 'the public prayers of the Church;' 'the Service Book,' containing the Divine service! White, in his Epistle to the

^a Calvin, in Epist., Jan. 18, 1555; Works, ed. 1667. Fol. vol. viii. p. 98. And see Erasmus, Annot. in ep. i. ad Corinth. xiv. 19.

Archbishop of Canterbury, before his book against the Sabbath, styles it 'the universal sacrifice which, amongst the Jews, was the daily offering, the morning and evening sacrifice.'... Now, this consecrate thing, more holy than the singular and affected devotions of private spirits, because devoted to God, by the Church and State, for His public service; what is it, but a device of man? a 'new cart,'^a taken up from the papists, as the Israelites in imitation of the Philistines heretofore did, to ease the Levites, who ought to have carried the Ark upon their own shoulders, and not suffered to be carried by beasts instead of men! The same thing is done here; Christ hath given 'gifts to men,'^b that those 'gifts' may be the foundation of offices for the edification of his 'body.'^c He hath given 'pastors and teachers,'^d and, therefore, the gift of teaching, the word of wisdom, and the word of knowledge; by the exercise of these gifts, in the several administrations whereto they serve, He will be honoured, and by an effectual operation, edify his 'body:' those who are fitted for such offices, and called to them, must therefore, to these ends, give themselves to prayer and to the ministry of the Word. In place hereof, is brought in, and enjoined to be used, this 'new cart' which a boy of twelve years old may drive. Even the meanest of the people, if he will draw near and fill his hand with this Service-book, may be a scribe instructed^e sufficiently, and furnished to bring forth what is here required! So that instead of Christ's way for his own honour, and his churches' edification, here is man's way brought in instead of the 'gifts' which He giveth and furnisheth men withal to be exercised in the ministry; here is a composure and frame of Divine Service, pieced up together into a body by some men, which must serve instead of 'gifts' to all men and for all times, and be enjoined to be used without variation, as coming from the public spirit of the church and thereby devoted. Hereby, they do not only set their *posts* by God's 'posts,'^f but they lay aside his, and enjoin theirs only to be used, as fitter for the building!

"If it be said, men are not prohibited to exercise the gift of prayer, nor preaching, in their public ministry: I answer, they are expressly enjoined to use no prayers but these consecrated Prayers of the Church in their public ministry; and this is *de jure*, whatever, in some places, is done *de facto*. And again; if we yield that they have authority to consecrate and enjoin one form which must not in a tittle be receded from, for sanctifying of some ordinances, as in the administration of the sacraments; they may, with a good authority, enjoin a set form for other ordinances, as the preaching of the Word: and they have done so. For preaching, I never yet saw substantial reason given that might show a difference between these two, The taking authority to make a Book of Common Public Prayer to read, which all shall be tied to in the exercise of the function of pastor and teacher, instead of praying: and, The taking authority to make a book of common public Sermons, and enjoining all pastors and teachers to read those, instead of preaching. But if it be unlawful to introduce and enjoin a public Homily book in place of the gift of teaching; it will be no less unlawful to bring in a

^a 1 Sam. vi. 7.^d Ver. 11.^b Eph. iv. 8.^c Matt. xiii. 52.^e Ver. 12.^f Ezek. xliii. 8.

Book of Common and Public Prayers, and enjoin the same upon all pastors and teachers, in place of the gift of prayer. Therefore, as they have done the one, they may with as good reason and authority do the other. For if the reading of Homilies, commanded in place of preaching, and all other preaching prohibited, do appear unto us unlawful,—and in that case, we should apprehend God's ordinance thrust out and man's device brought in place of it,—I would see a reason given, why we should not have the same apprehension of the other also, but that use and custom have reconciled us to the one and not to the other! Here, to fall into a dispute of Set-Forms of Prayers, in general, and endeavour, as Master Ball^a and others do, to prove that some Set-Forms of Prayer may, in some cases, by some persons, be used; or to ask, whether all directory Liturgies, appointed in some other churches, by way of direction only, not of injunction,—the officers being left at liberty, and the churches, to make use of them or not as they see occasion, and as their own gifts may be excited and helped thereby,—be altogether unlawful? is altogether besides the question; and rather changeth the state of the question than answereth the objection that is made against this,—to use king James, his words,—‘ill translated Mass-book,’ wherein some gross things only are pared off; and that, as being enjoined upon all churches, and thus pressed for such reasons, and with such respects, and circumstances: for if this may not be used, the parties whom they seek to satisfy, receive no satisfaction by all that can be spoken of the other, to induce them to use this.

“In the second place; if men for their own practice, could be free and dispensed withal for these particulars, yet there lieth a duty upon every member of a visible church which he is obliged to perform, or else he will partake of the guilt of ‘other men's sins;’^b and this duty, he shall not be suffered to perform. This obligation, lying upon every member in communion with a visible church, ariseth from the power of the Keys wherewith every visible church, and every member thereof, for his part, is entrusted by Christ; and, for the exercise of church trust, as the whole body, so every particular member shall be accountable, according to the neglect of duty therein. For this end, the Lord, by the apostles, hath cast Evangelical churches into such bodies as might, conveniently meet together ‘in one place,’ upon all occasions to exercise this power.^c . . . Other frames, of universal, national, provincial, and such like visible churches, are men's devices and constitutions, serving for and tending to a universal vicar; being either the same, or the image thereof [!]: standing upon the same grounds and reasons of human policy; and cannot be always existent for the remedy of offences and scandals to be brought to them, as Christ commandeth; but in a way of antichristian usurpation, by courts, chancellors, commissaries, officials, and such like officers of the kingdom of Antichrist; in imitation of earthly kingdoms: whereof there is no footstep in apostolical direction or practice; but the clean contrary. . . But, after their times, ‘the

^a See back, p. 46. This reference fixes the date of this piece to not earlier than 1640: see *infra*, p. 236, note b.

^b 1 Tim. v. 22.

^c Gal. i. 22; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal. i. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 23; with 1 Cor. v. 4., &c.

mystery of iniquity'^a soon brought forth, first the foundations of this tyranny, and then, by degrees, the entire building. . . The ways for particular members to keep themselves from being leavened and involved in the guilt of such common sins—1 Cor. v. 8.—are but two: either first, the doing of that, for their part, which is their duty in such a communion; or, secondly, if that will not be suffered or will not prevail, to disclaim the holding of such communion and join in a more pure. . . Men fall into long disputes, and bring many arguments to prove that the ordinances are not made less comfortable; or the partaking in them, made sinful to one man; because of the sins of other men who partake with them. They set up a man of straw to contend withal, and fight against what themselves have framed. It is not the sins of other men, as they are their personal acts, that can cast guilt upon any but themselves; but it is the suffering of these sins and sinners to pass, without such censure as the Lord hath appointed to be pronounced against them by those whom He hath invested with power to that end, which makes these sins the sins of the whole body that so neglect their duty enjoined them; and hereby 'a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.'^b So that they either deceive or are deceived, that agitate with so much eagerness this, as they say, strange opinion, That another man's sins, should hinder any from partaking, comfortably, in the ordinances. It is not another man's sin that hindereth; but their own! . . . Now, particular members are not suffered to discharge themselves by doing that duty which, in such a case,—of the church's neglect,—doth lie upon them to perform; or if they will perform it to their own acquitting and the church's edifying whereof they are members, they are no less certain to run upon ruin, in these times,^c than to prevail nothing at all with churches so constituted and consisting of such mixed multitudes as the most are. . . There is a necessity that doth lie upon many, to disjoin themselves from being members of divers churches in this kingdom,—that the obligation which, by reason of such a relation, will lie upon their conscience, may not press them when they cannot discharge the same;—and to unite . . . where they may—in doing, and submitting themselves mutually unto, all that Christ enjoineth them for his honour and their edification,—exercise communion in the use of all the ordinances free from the mixture of human inventions and antichristian usurpations.

"Suppose a congregation in this land; some town or parish, to speak common road language, wherein a company of godly men, saints all, so far as man can judge, had united themselves together by mutual consent, to walk in all the ordinances and ways of the Lord, without admitting the linsey-woolsey mixture of human invention; and with resolution not to be the servants of men, but to cast off their yokes, in things spiritual, and exalt the Lord alone to rule and judge in them and by them, according to the guidance of his Word: if, finding this society and their course fully to answer the persuasion of my heart concerning the way of God, I should change my habitation and take a house in that town, that I might thereby join myself to this company

^a 2 Thess. ii. 7.

^b 1 Cor. v. 6.

^c "This discourse was written some years since, when the times were perilous." *Marg.* See back, p. 235, note a.

in church-fellowship; because this is your dark and ignorant way of falling into fellowship here in this land, there would be no complaining, no out-cry of 'separation,' no whispering and muttering of forsaking 'the mother church,' no writing up and down to intimate the great fear there was of seduction and separation, and the scandal that would arise from thence; and yet I should come out, thereby, from holding external communion with one congregation, whose external communion I saw so many corruptions so weaved into, that I could not hold it, and be free from them, and [should] join myself in communion with another who exercised a communion between themselves free from such corruptions and bondage. And, should I, or others, do any more but the same thing, if, in one street of a town, we should join ourselves together in communion for spiritual ends; and separate ourselves from the external communion which is held in another [street], burdened with many superstitions, and submitting themselves to bear the yoke of bondage imposed by men who lord it over them in things spiritual: and all this, without breaking off from internal communion with any saint amongst them; consisting in the embracing and holding the doctrine of the same true faith and obedience, but separating alone from their corruptions and continuance in disobedience. Wherein, then, serveth the raising of so much noise and clamour of 'separation,' but to give up friends into the hands of enemies!

"I have, in my plain way, endeavoured to express my judgment in these particulars; desiring to be always ready to open my eyes to receive further light from whomsoever it shall be showed unto me: in the meantime, I must walk according to that I have; accepting no man's person, nor giving flattering titles to man.^a I pretend not to so much scholarship, that you should require of me exactness in method or expression; therefore, I pray you, stick not upon some expressions which you may conceive not so meet, to winnow and fan them by scholastic wit: neither quarrel with me for a loose discourse; I rest satisfied with expressing myself to be understood. But if there be any begged principles, or grounds wanting proof, or anything inferred from grounds too weak to maintain the same; stay upon these, and make that appear unto me, and I shall either make them good, and able to stand upon solid foundations,—at least to my apprehension,—or quit them. Any other way of answer but this only, will be received by me as the fruit of an acute wit, much exercised in controversial writing, and work no other effect.

"I expect, upon your answer, to be put to make good these two; first, The constitution of a visible church under the Gospel; secondly, the power thereof; wherein will consist *cardo questionis*: all turning about, upon the determination of these. I shall make appear what I have said, I hope, not to be 'the fancy of Mr. Jacob,' as you please to say; a learned man, deserving not to be slighted; nor of any man, but the truth of God, having ground in his Word, and embraced for such not by shrubs in learning, as some may be thought to be, but by the strongest and tallest 'cedars of Lebanon' for learning and piety!"

^a Job xxxii. 21.

CHAP. XLVIII.

ANATOMY OF INDEPENDENCY.—THE ANATOMIST ANATOMISED.—

QUERIES.—OBSERVATIONS, ETC. BY A. S.

Who, with only the foregoing tract of the five Apologists in his hand, could imagine that it would cause so much excitement as it rapidly produced. The swarm of replies betrayed but the apprehension of their authors, lest the plot of substituting their plan of politico-ecclesiastical machinery for that which the nation had, for the present, discarded, should fail? Many curious particulars are evolved in their pages, which enable us to penetrate far into the real condition of affairs, and the relative position of parties. The first that meets our view is intitled "An Anatomy of Independency: Or, A Brief Commentary, and Moderate Discourse, upon the 'Apologetical Narration, etc.' By Argument, laying naked the dangers of their Positions; and from Experience, discovering their Spirits and Ways.—1 Thess. v. 22.—Published by Authority.—Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 52.

This piece is attributed to Alexander Forbes. The Preface asserts that "a main hindrance unto Reformation... proceeds from a gross mistake, whereby all, opposing the ways of the Hierarchy, are judged by the ways of some, and equally and indifferently ranked in one rank, and delineated by one character, and under one notion of Puritan, Brownist, or Independent, if not of Anabaptist." Such being the case, as Forbes represents it, he adds, "It must be found a thing not only expedient, but also very necessary, to make a full discovery of men and their opinions and ways; that every man appearing in his own colours and livery, may be the better discerned and owned... These being the sincere aims and ends of this ensuing discourse,—though my weakness may perhaps in measure frustrate both me and it, of obtaining these ends;—yet I hope the integrity of these aims shall procure... pardon for what may come short thereof; especially from these my brethren the authors of this Apology, since it is their main desire to be discovered and judged by experience of their ways and spirits: which is the work of this discourse."

Forbes begins accordingly by commenting upon the "sudden and unexpected noise" which the Apologists advert to in their opening. This, he writes, makes him "suspect there might be some reality in such noises of unexpected and strange exclamations and expressions of Independents against Presbyterial government, as have come to our ears; which," this commentator construes "might be the cause of the suddenness of these exclamations" against the aforesaid Apologists! But, he adds, "that they should not have expected this 'noise,'—as it might seem somewhat strange to any who know how liberal they have been, from time to time, to vent their contumelious and scornful censures on Presbyterial government; and considers them standing at such a distance in their ways and government, from all Christian churches;—so, on the other hand, it seems no way strange to me, that these, who are possest with such a conceit and confidence of themselves, their abilities in

searching and finding out new truths, and their ways, as is ordinary for most of their mould to be, and as this Apology shows they are; should not expect to hear any whisper against them, though they may censure others at their pleasure!"^a And he asks, in the next page, "May it not seem strange that these our Brethren should be so averse from owning exclamations against Independency and Independents, as directed against them? Whereas they not only profess here in this Apology, what pains they have taken to find out and establish in their churches that 'government' which they know the world calls Independency; but know also, that they are looked upon generally by all, as the chief authors and abettors thereof in all England!"^b

"They will not own the name of 'Independency,' yet, if we speak or preach against Independency, they will tell us we preach against them; as appeared in a late instance of one of these our Brethren's own fellow-labourers in the same congregation at Rotterdam, with some one of his flock, expostulating with another Reverend Divine for telling his people that that government which they swear to maintain in the Scots' Covenant, did exclude Independency; affirming, 'this was to preach against them.' This 'noise' enforced them to this Apology; and that by anticipation. . . This Apology comes forth when there was likelihood they should be frustrate of liberty; the desire whereof, is the conclusion and result. . . It shall, God willing, appear, that their main study here is to cover rather than 'discover' themselves: concealing most of their differences from us, and delivering some only in general terms—as, that the 'truth' of church discipline lieth in 'a middle way betwixt Brownism and Presbyterial government;' without telling us wherein this 'middle way' doth consist."^c

"Our Brethren's 'government' hath always been accompanied with sects and schisms, strife and debate, multiplying of churches out of churches; and the people's casting off their pastors at their pleasure by their Independent liberty: and if not casting them off, yet improving that power they assume, as due unto them to the utmost in reproaching, rebuking, and drawing up Articles against them. Whereof Mr. Bridge and others have found plentiful experience at Rotterdam. . . A great part of that church . . . joined with others to the erecting of that church whereof Mr. Simpson was pastor, and were by him received without any more ado, notwithstanding that their schism. . . These two churches being of late, commanded by the Magistrates of Rotterdam to unite again in one; and that church whereof Mr. Simpson had been pastor, and Mr. Symonds^d then was, being unwilling to join the other, unless some members thereof should first be put off, especially one, . . . their Teacher must be forced, —as himself confesseth with grief of heart, having nothing to except against the person,—to urge him to take his dismissal. . . Who knoweth not that holy and learned men, as these our Brethren are known to be, may hold forth a spirit of holiness in actions not approvable? . . . As it was Dr. Ames, his prudence and charity, not to judge simply and abso-

^a P. 1.^b P. 2.^c P. 2, 3.

^d See Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 40; where, as it appears that "Joseph Symonds" was returned to London, in 1641, so he might be the person intended by Baillie: see back, p. 56. Steven, "*Hist. Scottish Church, Rotterdam, &c. 1833*," p. 335, had not heard of this Symonds.

lutely of Dr. Burgess, his spirit, but only of that spirit which God left him to put on, when he became a 'Rejoinder,' by the marks of his spirit in that work; so shall this be a fit place for us not to judge absolutely of our Brethren's spirits, but only to discover what spirit God seemeth to have left them to in this their plea and Apology."^a

"That wherein they were to satisfy the world by this Apology, ought to have been a clear discovery of their opinions and ways wherein they differ from us; and a vindication of the truth and equity of these above ours. . . . Whereto serves this Apology? Unless it be by big and plausible words to gain the affections of the unstable vulgar before they shall know their ways, which is to hold out a popular spirit. . . . The confidence they have of their looking upon the Word of God 'as impartially, and unprejudicedly, as men made of flesh and blood are like to do in any juncture of time that may fall out:'^b surely, humility, and impartial respect to themselves, would have blushed to own such an expression, and have taught them to judge better of others than themselves! . . . Might there not be some 'juncture of time' as much favouring others in this, as that did them? . . . Consider we, the different eye wherewith they looked upon the writings and practice of other Reformed Churches and the old Nonconformists, and those of New England; and if they have looked no more 'impartially' on the Word of God, they shall appear to have been but flesh and blood! Here, first, One argument why they judge the Discipline of other Reformed Churches not so good as their own, is because they found that that Discipline was not so accompanied with the practice and power of godliness as they found even that in England, however 'accompanied with more peace.'^c Is not this prejudice and partiality, to respect a government, because they cannot discern those under that government to be proportionable in 'godliness' to those whom, I think, they will not say lived under a better, but, we may confidently say, under a worse; to wit, Episcopacy? . . . Secondly, They but 'consulted with reverence' with the 'practice and writings' of other Reformed Churches; but they looked upon the 'light' of the 'old Nonconformists' as matter of advantage to them; and what 'they had written,' came more 'commended' unto them, not only because they were their 'own,' but 'because sealed with their manifold and bitter sufferings.'^d So, also, 'the ways and practices' of those of New England they propounded as 'examples' to themselves;—this is more than, 'with reverence, to consult' with them! . . . Hereunto we may add, their partial and tender care and wariness of saving the credit of those of the 'Separation,' whom they will not call 'Brownists,' but whom, say they, 'ye,'—that is, we,—'call Brownists:' noways thus tender or careful of the credit of other Reformed Churches. . . . Thirdly, If we will take a further scantling of their partiality and pride in this Apology, let us more particularly consider their aggravations of their 'miseries,' . . . as, assuming so frequently the title of 'Exiles,—God's poor Exiles,—sufferers even to exile; . . . 'the saddest days' of their 'pilgrimage on earth,' and so forth; . . . but I have had occasion to be somewhat acquainted with their conditions there; and I profess sincerely, that, all things considered and compared, a man, in such a condition might be well content

^a P. 5—7.^b Ap. Nar. p. 3.^c *Ib.* p. 4.^d *Idem.*

to esteem any country his native country; such 'miserics,' mercies; and such days the most comfortable days of his 'pilgrimage;' and never to desire to come off that service with life. Oh, how pride and partial self-love turn mercies into 'miserics!' Fourthly, Look we on the excessive hyperbolical encomiastics, whereby they magnify the actions and qualities of men of their own profession, and see if there be no partial spirit. . . Fifthly, Compare we the weakness and deficiency of the Founders of Reformation in the Calvinian churches, in attaining to the perfection of that Reformation 'the first day,'^a as they call it; . . it would appear, the world would have come to a better and more perfect issue, if they had been the first Founders of Reformation! Sixthly, . . To come to such a judicatory as they acknowledge the Parliament to be, and require an allowance and Toleration in the practice of their unknown and unjustified opinions and ways; . . if this be that respect and authority they give to the Civil Magistrate beyond us, we can well spare them this precedency."^b

"What concerneth a spirit of faction, singularity, and schism; let the world judge whether, for these our Brethren, without the knowledge and consent of that 'Assembly' whereof they are 'Members,' to set out an 'Apology' of this nature to desire a Toleration before their ways be known and taken into consideration by the 'Assembly,' . . savoureth not of a spirit of faction, etc. It is certain there is a party and faction, and a headstrong one too, of their profession in England; and therefore it is not easily to be imagined that this can be, without some influence from them who are known to be the chief owners and patrons of these opinions there."^c

"They cannot endure the name of a 'National Church,' not only as Episcopal men absurdly understand it, meaning thereby the Bishops of a nation, or a Convocation; but even as we rightly understand it to be meant of all the particular congregations making one entire body which is represented in a National synod! And therefore, in this 'Apology,' they constantly speak of the 'churches' of England, in the plural, never of the Church of England, in the singular number."^d

"Why do they tell us of their appearing and appealing 'first'^e before or unto the Parliament? . . I can conjecture no other reason why this word 'first' was inserted, unless it were to pacify the 'Assembly of Divines,' in showing themselves willing, afterwards to appear before them. . . This kind of disorderly appeals, troubling Parliaments with such matters,—the decision of Ecclesiastical controversies,—inverting the order of legal proceedings; contemning the 'Order' of Parliaments, and slighting and neglecting inferior judicatories; may show us how likely it is that their 'mould' will be 'co-existent with the peace of any form of civil government on earth,'^f as they affirm. Though it hath been observed to be the impudently false language of some, that their mould and government is the main cause of Christ the Parliament contends for; yet I suppose the peace of this Parliamentary Government hath been somewhat disturbed by their 'mould.' And if it be the same with that of 'Brownists,' to wit popular government, as experience hath

^a *Ib.* p. 22. ^b P. 8—13. ^c P. 13. ^d P. 14. ^e *Apol. Nar.* p. 1. ^f *Ib.* p. 3.

and doth hitherto demonstrate,—whatever ‘middle way’ they tell us of, —then the many long and bitter lawsuits before the governors and government of Amsterdam, flowing from the shameful rents and divisions occasioned by that mould, may tell us how likely their ‘mould’ is to be ‘co-existent’ with the peace of any civil government on earth! Neither hath the peace of the civil government of Rotterdam been altogether free of disturbance by their mould. I could yet give other symptoms of the co-existence of their mould with the peace of any other civil government, if I would follow their example in going about to exasperate the spirits of those in Authority against them, as they endeavour to do against us, by telling the world that they ‘give as much, and,’ as they think, ‘more,’ to the Magistrate’s power, ‘than the principles of Presbyterian government’ will ‘suffer’ us to yield.^a . . . I leave the impartial to apprehend, whether they should not rather be found to be hinderers than furtherers both of the peace and Reformation intended; unless they apprehend their ‘government’ to be the Reformation intended! . . . These men and Bishops may, in the end, be like to agree and conspire again *in odium tertii*: for better one bishop than many.”^b

“They acknowledge no man a true minister by virtue of his ordination in England; but all their acknowledgment of any true ministry in England is only by virtue of an explicit or implicit Call, grounded on that explicit and implicit covenant with him. Hence, they all renounced their ordination in England, and ordained one another in Holland. When Master Ward^c was chosen pastor, and Master Bridge, teacher at Rotterdam,—first Mr. Bridge ordained Mr. Ward, and then immediately Mr. Ward again ordained Mr. Bridge.”^d

“Those of them who were at Rotterdam, know what opposition Master Parke^e had from the Dutch church at Delph, the ministers thereof drawing their main plea from the confusions and schisms of Rotterdam; . . . where their preachers had maintenance allowed them; and that was by reason that that church was formerly under Presbyterian government and conformable to the Dutch churches, and had only begun to decline towards their ways a little before their coming to it in Master Peters his time, who yet notwithstanding professeth himself, at this hour, to be a Presbyterian man, for all his having been in New England since his being pastor of that church! Mr. Simpson’s church maintained their own officers, and preached in a private house, which they then fitted to be a public allowed church since,—if this word ‘church’ in this sense, be not offensive to them. . . . We confess they acknowledged them [the Reformed Churches] for true churches, yet it is not unknown with what disdain and censure they and their Presbyterian way have been commonly spoken of at Rotterdam. Neither can they show us such a correspondency and fraternity between them and these churches, as I am,—and I believe truly—informed Mr. Simpson’s church—whether by him, or after his time by Master Symonds,^f I have not inquired—entered in with those of the ‘Separation’ at Amsterdam,

^a *Ib.* p. 19.

^b P. 17—19.

^c Samuel Ward, B.D. See an interesting account of him in Brook’s *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 452.

^d P. 22.

^e See Brook’s *Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 39.

^f See Brook, vol. iii. p. 39.

by a mutual covenant and agreement to own each other. I believe it to be by virtue of that correspondency and covenant that some of their members,—not officers of the church, nor ecclesiastical persons,—do publicly preach in Master Canne's pulpit at Amsterdam.^a

“ They grievously complain that ‘ the odious name of Brownism, together with all their opinions’ . . . are cast upon them : a man would think, therefore, that it should concern those men . . . to show the world fully how much they differ from Brownists ; . . . and yet . . . they mention nothing but what is the way and practice of the Brownists in conformity with us, as fully as theirs ! . . . Mr. Simpson's often hearers and very good friends, told me his prayers and sermons contained little or no matter of confession of sin, or threatening of judgment, or what concerned the Law, or repentance ; but of exalting the grace of God in Christ already wrought, and of thanksgiving, as being bound to frame his sermons and direct his speech to the benefit of none but those of his own church on whom he looked as already converted ; these, therefore, he was only to confirm and awaken to thankfulness, and not to aim at the conversion of any, it being the ordinary opinion among them that this is not the work of a pastor.”^b

“ They tell us their Officers are the same with those allowed by the Reformed Churches ; but so are the Brownists' officers also. Why did they not tell us, whether their way of calling and ordaining their officers was the same or not ? Here we should have seen that an officer cannot be ‘ called,’ among them, unless he be first a member of their own church, as among the Brownists : so that if they be to ‘ call’ some one who hath been, or is a pastor, elsewhere, he is not capable of a ‘ call’ to be their pastor ; but they must only ‘ call’ him to be a member with them, and he must take his hazard of being called Pastor, after he hath left his former charge . . . I hear of no ‘ ruling elders’ that ever Master Simpson had in his church, but that he thought that office unlawful.”^c

“ They do not complain that they are simply made to own all the opinions of Brownism ; but that they are made to own them, as they are stated and maintained by them.”^d

We find nothing, after the foregoing, “ much material to take notice of,” to use Forbes's own phrase,^e till we arrive at the fifty-first page, where he writes, “ Another pretty argument they have to prove the efficacy of this their ‘ way :’ . . . ‘ Suppose,’ say they, ‘ that other principle—of an authoritative power,’ in combining churches to excommunicate other churches, to be the ordinance of God, ‘ yet’ say they, ‘ unless it do take hold of men's consciences,’ the offending churches will ‘ slight’ it, as much as that other ‘ way.’ On the other side, say they, ‘ Let this way of ours be but as strongly entertained, as that which is the way of Christ, etc.,’ and ‘ it will awe men's consciences as much.’^f To which I shall give no other answer, but that this is a way of arguing which is sure to carry the cause !”

Forbes's attack was soon followed, as from its personalities might have been expected, by a self-vindication from the individual more particu-

^a P. 23, 24.^b P. 25.^c P. 26.^d P. 27.^e P. 52.^f Ap. Nar. p. 18.

larly aimed at, who retorted under the title of "The Anatomist Anatomised: Or, A short Answer to some things in the Book intituled 'An Anatomy of Independency.' Wherein it is showed, That many things reported are misreported: That if all were true, yet divulging of them in this manner, is not according to the Word of God: Nor, argumentative against the Cause that is falsely called 'Independency.'—Gal. iv. 17. Heb. xii. 3.—By Sidrach Simpson.—Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 12.

Simpson commences by remarking, that "There are two too usual errors in handling controversies: one, to make the difference voluminous and many-headed; . . . the other, to make the opposites odious." Both these, he says, are committed in the present controversies of Church Government, against the Apologists. "Some write large books, and lay together all that is writ by any, or reported to be any man's, as though it were maintained by them all; whereas . . . the difference lies but in a very few particulars: . . . others, fall foul upon their persons: First, To brand them with the name of 'Independents:' a name which, formerly, was proper unto those who stood for Presbyterial government! Under that very name, they chose to argue against Bishops, above any other; and the Bishops called them by it.^a But since it came to be a reproach, they have put it upon those who count it 'proud and insolent.'^b And [secondly,] Lest this brand should be worn out, and their opinion not hurt their names; an ill report is given of them, by their conversation to discredit their opinion. When the 'Apologetical Narration' came first out, many rejoiced in it, and gave us thanks for it; but presently the authors were reported to be 'cunning, proud, boasters of themselves;' and, what not? . . . But besides that report, there is an 'Antapology'^c in [the] press; or a collection of such faults as either men's mistakes and malice, or perhaps men's own infirmities have made, either beyond the seas or here. This 'Anatomist' is a forerunner to that, as some few great drops before a shower! . . . Is this your aim, To make us despised of the people? The best way to that, were to have proved things orderly and fully; and, that our faults come from our Cause, as well as from ourselves! Or, is this your aim, By oppression to provoke us to write more of you than you have done of us? that so, if we cannot be punished for any foulness in opinion, yet we may be for unpeaceableness!"^d

"Things were not, as they are reported: He saith, 'A great part of that church . . . joined with others to the erecting of that church whereof Mr. Simpson was pastor, etc.'^e The truth is, that *none* that ever were of that church did join to the *erecting* of that church where I was. They were all such as had not joined themselves to any congregation before. A 'great part' of that church never did, at any time, join them: they were a very few."^f

"The defection of *some* of their members to Anabaptism: how apt

^a "That wherein we," that is, Bishops and Presbyters, "contradict one another, is, We," that is the Presbyterians, "affirm that all churches were single congregations Equal and Independent each on other in regard of subjection."—The Diocesan's Trial, by Paul Baynes, A.M. 1621. p. 13. See back, p. 185.

^b Ap. Nar. p. 23.

^c See Chap. LIV.

^d P. 1—8.

^e Anat. p. 6.

^f P. 8.

others of them are to be made a prey therein . . more than the members of other Reformed Churches, as late instance hath manifested, some having professed [that] Mr. Simpson's principles have made them Anabaptists.^a This 'some' that 'professed' so, is but one, of all that ever I have heard!"^b

"What 'flaming sword' is there in the hand of a Classical Presbytery to keep men out of errors, which may not be in a Congregation? In one Congregation there may be as many presbyters as, from many congregations, make a classis: and why, then, may they not do the self-same acts? Their officers and office are the same, and therefore the promise of assistance is the same. And if the counsel and advice of other neighbour churches be required, a Congregation may have that as well, and perhaps sooner than a Classis can; which must stay for a Provincial Synod! There have been as great defections both of ministers and people unto errors, under Presbyterial government as under any other: as is clear in the Low Countries, where so many ministers and people turned Arminians, Papists, Socinians: . . and in other countries too!"^c

"Mr. Simpson's church [met] in a private house, etc."^d Six months at least, before the church was gathered, we had a public act to do it, by the State of Rotterdam. . . The place wherein we met was in an open street, a noted place near the Exchange. . . The public Act runs thus, 'To have such ministers as they shall choose from time to time; and such Discipline as they conceive to be according to the Word of God: and to be protected in this, with the same care and love our own natives are.'^e

"There is 'a mutual covenant between Mr. Simpson's church and those of the Separation at Amsterdam, to own each other.'^f This was not in my time; nor have I heard it hitherto. How near soever they are joined, yet this, I am sure, is not to any separation from the churches of Christ, though they be not of their judgments for church government."^g

"Mr. Simpson's 'prayers and sermons contained little or no matter of confession of sin, etc., as being bound to frame his sermons and direct his speech to the benefit of none but those of his own church; . . it being the ordinary opinion among them, that this is not the work of a pastor.'^h It is neither the 'ordinary' opinion, nor of any one, that ever I heard of; but the contrary: much less was I 'bound' unto it!"ⁱ

"Mr. Simpson had no ruling elders, but thought that office unlawful."^k It is true, *de facto* we had none, but were resolved to have them. Their office and duty hath been opened by me, and the church informed of their necessary use. I know not that ever any word was spoken, or any thing insinuated against that office, by me. But if I were, I should not be alone: all that allow the Presbyterial government allow not them; and some that do, yet think there is no *jus divinum* for them: so that whatever evil follows my supposed tenet, follows from yourselves as well!"^l

^a Anat. p. 6, 7.^b P. 9.^c P. 10.^d Anat. p. 24.^e P. 10, 11.^f Anat. p. 24.^g P. 11.^h Anat. p. 25.ⁱ P. 11.^k Anat. p. 26.^l P. ult.

"If I may but obtain this, That the Reader will not believe those, or any other reports of this kind, which are either in this book or in that which is coming forth, until the authors of them will appear and bring their witnesses to a fair hearing in any lawful, though the strictest, judicature, where we may suffer if we have done what is reported, or else the reporters may,—a small and just request,—I have the scope and end I aim at."^a

The tract to which Simpson's, as we have seen, is a short answer, was not the only production called into existence from the pens of those who felt that the reputation of their countrymen and their religion was being indirectly tarnished by the Apologetical Narration. No time was lost in composing a vindication, under the title of "The Reformation of Church Government in Scotland, Cleared from some Mistakes and Prejudices: By the Commissioners of the General Assembly.—Lond. 1644." 4to. But we pass, at present, those disciples of Knox, that we may attend to some "Queries of Highest Consideration, Proposed to Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Philip Nye, Mr. Wil. Bridge, Mr. Jer. Burroughes, Mr. Sidr. Simpson: And, to the Commissioners from the General Assembly, so called, of the Church of Scotland. Upon Occasion of their late Printed Apologies for Themselves and their Churches.—In all Humble Reverence, presented to the View of the Rt. Hon. the Houses of the High Court of Parliament.—Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 13.

"We have been humbly bold," it is said in the Epistle to the Parliament, "to presume, as Esther into Ahasuerus' presence, against your Order: for who can pass the many locks and bars of any the several Licensers, appointed by you, with such a Message? By such circumscribing and immuring of yourselves, by such a guard,—their persons we honour and esteem,—it is rarely possible that any other light but what their hemisphere affords shall ever shine on your Honours' souls, though never so sweet, so necessary; and though it come from God, from heaven!

"These worthy and much esteemed persons unto whom we Query . . appear in the front, and present their moulds and patterns of church-government from Holland, from Scotland, to an inquiring England. Their mutual just exceptions, which they have already or may further express against each other's tenets, we leave to themselves; though we might express them to our advantage. We shall be humbly bold . . to present such Queries to your Honours' view as respect their joint 'agreement'—pardon the phrase,—like Ephraim and Manasseh, though fighting each against other, yet both against Christ Jesus, the Lion of Judah's tribe; we mean, so far as they oppose the truth and purity of His last Will and Testament. . . Concerning souls, we will not, as most do, charge you with the loads of all the souls in England, Scotland, and Ireland: we shall humbly affirm, and, by the help of Christ, maintain, That the bodies and goods of the Subject, is your charge: their souls and yours are set on account, to those that profess to be the 'lights and guides,' the 'messengers and ambassadors,' sent from heaven to them.

^a *Ibid. fin.*

“ You will please to say, We are constantly told, and we believe it, That Religion is our first care; and Reformation of that, our greatest task: Right Honourable, Your Wisdoms know the fatal miscarriages of England’s Parliaments in this point: what setting up, pulling down; what formings, reformings, and again deformings, to admiration! Three instances are dreadful, yet to express, seasonable.—First: The last and best of England’s changes, established ‘ Lord Bishops;’ they and two more, Priests and Deacons, are by law the established ministers of England’s Church. The former makes [*sic*] the latter, so far as concerns a lawful, external, Calling. The ‘ Lord Bishops’ themselves are now voted ‘ antichristian:’ your Wisdoms, then, see what Callings by law, the other two sorts, Priests and Deacons, have all this while been furnished with! Secondly: If he that eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ ‘ unworthily,’ eateth and drinketh his own ‘ judgment,’^a and all English souls are bound by law to eat that ‘ body’ and ‘ blood’ at sixteen; who sees not—since, as it is confest, scarce one of a thousand but is found ignorant, impenitent, unregenerate, at those years,—that the body of the people are compelled by law to eat and drink, at sixteen, their own ‘ judgment?’ Thirdly: For Nonconforming to these and other practices, the English Mass-book, etc.; what heavy persecution have thousands felt, and that ‘ By Law Established?’

“ We shall, in all humble reverence, suggest our fears, that for the very laws and statutes of England’s Parliaments, concerning Religion, and haply for some not yet suspected, the Lord Jesus hath drawn this sword that is daily drunk with English blood! It shall never be your honour, to this or future ages, to be confined to the ‘ Patterns’ of either French, Dutch, Scotch, or New-English, churches. We humbly conceive some higher Act concerning Religion, attends and becomes your consultations. If He whose name is ‘ Wonderful, Counsellor,’ be consulted, and obeyed, according to his last Will and Testament,—as you may please in the Queries, to view,—we are confident you shall exceed the Acts and Patterns of all neighbour nations; highly exalt the Name of the Son of God; provide for the peace of this distracted State; engage the souls of all that fear God, to give thanks and supplicate for you; further the salvation of thousands; and leave the sweet perfume of your names precious to all succeeding generations.”

The first Query seeks after the Scripture precept for the “ Synod, or Assembly of *Divines* ;” and anticipating a reference to Acts xv., “ as all Popish synods and councils do,” it is then urged, That, “ if two or three brethren of one particular congregation at Antioch,” being sent to the church at Jerusalem, “ where the apostles were, who being immediately inspired from God, could say, ‘ It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, etc.,’ ”^b and who also made “ decrees ” for all the “ churches,”^c Whether this be a pattern for a nation or kingdom? If so, why not for “ more nations ;” and for “ all the world,” if under one government, as in Augustus Cæsar’s tax;^d “ to send their several priests and deacons,—for other spiritual officers than bishops, priests, and deacons, you know we have not,—to reform or form a religion,

^a 1 Cor. xi. 29.^b Acts xv. 28.^c Acts xvi. 4, 5.^d Luke ii. 11.

etc.?" It is submitted, "If the 'golden image'^a be not a type of the several national and state religions;" and which "ours" hath set up; and for which the wrath of God is now upon us? The title, "*The Assembly of Divines*," is impugned as an appropriation of what seems to be "common to all the children of God."

Under the second Query, on the proposition, that the Five Brethren and the Scots' Commissioners "both agree, though with some difference," that the Civil Magistrate must "reform the Church," as the one says; and as the other says, "establish religion;" so, consequently, he must first judicially determine which religion is true and which is false, "or else, must implicitly believe as the Assembly believes, and take it upon trust; and the magistrate is the head, root, and fountain of the supremacy of all spiritual power, and hath the power of the keys, of opening and shutting heaven-gates, etc.:" of which power Henry VIII., "with consent and act of Parliament," despoiled the Pope: we now Query, "since the Parliament, being the representative of the commonwealth, hath no other power but what the commonweal derive unto and betrust it with, Whether it will not evidently follow, "That the commonweal, the nation, the kingdom; and if it were in Augustus' time, the whole 'world;' must rule and govern the church, and consequently "Christ" himself, as the church is called, 1 Cor. xii. 12? And, if the Honourable Houses erect a spiritual court, Whether or not, although a new name be put upon it, such a court be not, in its nature, a "High Commission?" "Is not this a reviving of Moses, and the sanctifying of a new land of Canaan, of which we hear nothing in the Testament of Christ Jesus; nor of any other holy nation, but the particular church of Christ, 1 Pet. ii. 9?" Is not "this," to subject this "holy nation," this "heavenly Jerusalem," the spouse of Jesus, "the pillar and ground of truth," to the vain, uncertain "mutations" of this present evil world? Who knows not, in how few years the commonweal of England hath set up and pulled down [religion]? The fathers made the children heretics; and the children, the fathers. And the present Parliament would have been esteemed heretical in former times! Since, then, the commonweal cannot, without a spiritual rape, force the consciences of all to one [mode of] worship, may it never commit that which a stronger arm and sword may soon, as formerly, arise and alter.

The third and fourth Queries are connected; and fear and trembling are hinted at, lest those to whom the queries are addressed "be found to reject the 'Corner-stone,' in not fitting to Him only 'living stones.'"^b The one party "confess and practise," that without true matter it is impossible to build "a spiritual house" unto God:^c the other, "mingles sheep and goats together." Few of the people, and fewer of the gentry, are such spiritual matter, "living stones," truly regenerate and converted.

The fifth, grounds all reformation, in a "dead soul," upon "repentance:"^d where external forms matter nothing, as "a thousand new forms of postures, in an army of Cavaliers, cannot make a Parliament

^a Dan. iii.^b 1 Pet. ii. 5, 6.^c *Ib.* ver. 5.^d Heb. vi. 6.

army." Allegations may be brought from the "corruptions" of the church of the Jews, and the churches of Christ; but reformation should have reference to the Institution alone.

The sixth Query is exactly such a one as might have proceeded from Erastians, whom, but for the next following query, we had imagined to be the originating source of this anonymous piece. "We query, Whether there hath not been as holy, able, and zealous men since the Apostacy; men like Antipas, faithful witnesses of the Lord Jesus, in what light they saw, even to death,^a who yet never came up to such a work of reformation as you speak of; and others, as excellent and heavenly as yourselves and fathers, whose professed Reformation you now dislike?"

The seventh, turning upon Heb. i. 1, 2, is, Where do you "now" find "one footstep, print, or pattern," in this doctrine of the Son of God, for a "national holy-covenant;" and so consequently,—though we conceive the one of you stumble at it,—for "a national church?" Such as hold "a national church of God," must needs disclaim Christ, and follow Moses! And that doctrine leads "unavoidably" to "a holy covenant of many nations." But the doctrine of Christ Jesus tells us, "In every nation, *he* that feareth Him, etc.;"^b not *every nation* that feareth Him! "The light of much truth may shine forth on the *brazen* candlesticks of strong national churches, maintained and held up by the seeming strong sword of steel in an arm of flesh: there may be silver candlesticks, more refined and pure in respect of the matter of which they are constituted, namely, godly persons, etc.; but Jesus Christ only walks in the midst of his 'golden candlesticks,'^c gathered and governed after the golden institution of his Word, which is like 'fine gold.'"^d

The eighth Query condemns the fighting for religion, since there is no "precept or promise" for civil war for Christ's sake, but what is limited by Rom. xiii. If security may be taken by the wisdom of the State for civil subjection; still, why may not even Papists themselves, and their consciences, be permitted in the world? "For, otherwise, if England's government were the government of the whole world, not only they but a world of idolaters of all sorts, yea the whole world, must be driven out of the world!"

The ninth Query relates to the sufferings of God's children; and proposes, Whether the term commonly applied to those who lost their lives for Jesus, "martyrs," that is, "witnesses,"^e be not applicable to all the servants of Christ who witness against any part of the "Beast's" kingdom and tyranny, although they never witness to the death?

The tenth, is, Whether, since the Five Apologists and the Scots' Commissioners report their "opposing and suppressing of heresies," and their "glorious success," that be a demonstrative argument from the Scriptures for a truth of a church; or, government of it; as even the Church of Rome may boast of the same, against many schisms and heresies? And, Whether the power of godliness, shining forth in persons, may evidence their state and worship good? "You both confess the great profession of the power of godliness in England: yet we be-

^a Rev. ii. 13.^b Acts x. 35.^c Rev. i. 12.^d Psal. xix. 10.^e Rev. xi. 3

lieve the one of you acknowledge the Church of England, as a national church, not true; and both, confess the government, governors, and the Common Prayer,—the service and worship of it,—to be abominable. Yet it is confest, that England's "false" national church, with her bishops, common-prayer, ceremonies, etc., had more evidence of the power of godliness in her children than was to be found amongst the Scotch, French, Dutch, who pretend a Reformation purer! It seems, therefore, evident, That neither opposing of heresies, nor success in victories, deliverances, nor power of godliness in some persons, can evidence and prove their state and worship to be right and pleasing unto God, according to his ordinance in Jesus Christ."

The eleventh Query states that "since you both seem to magnify the seals of baptism and the Lord's supper with a difference and excellency above other ordinances, we query, Where the Lord Jesus appointed such a difference and distinction? Whether there was not as full communion practised by the first christians, in the word, prayer, and community, as in breaking of bread, Acts ii. 42? Further, Since baptism is one of those fundamentals, Heb. vi., and every one that will be saved is bound to prove his faith and his baptism true, Mark xvi. 16; we query, How two baptisms, or two great seals, can be true in the kingdom of Christ Jesus, any more than two great seals can be true in the kingdom of England?... To insist upon a late instance: since the Bishops' power and calling is condemned as antichristian; How can we evidence the seal of baptism true, which we have received from them? Furthermore, since a true baptism giveth right to all the ordinances of Christ Jesus; we query, How any Protestant or Papist, whose baptism you acknowledge to be true, can be denied communion in the supper also, according to 1 Cor. xii. 13, 'By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,' and, consequently, into the participation of the ordinances thereof: and if so, we query, How far off Rome and the Pope himself is from our bosoms?"

The last, or twelfth Query, commences in these terms: "Since you both profess to want more light; and that a greater light is yet to be expected;... we query, How you can profess and swear to persecute all others as schismatics, heretics, etc., that believe they see a further light, and dare not join with either of your churches?... Whether the states of Holland, who tolerate, though not own, as you say, the several sects amongst them, ... come not nearer to the holy pattern and command of the Lord Jesus; to permit the 'tares' to have a civil being in the 'field' of the 'world,' until the 'harvest'^a—the end of it?"

Having from necessity compressed all the queries with what care we could, we now give thus much of the concluding matter:—"We know the allegations against this council. The head of all is, that from 'Moses', not Christ's pattern, in the typical land of Canaan, the kings of Israel and Judah, etc.'—we humbly desire it may be searched into, and we believe it will be found but one of Moses' shadows, vanished at the coming of the Lord Jesus; yet such a shadow as is directly opposite to the very Testament and coming of the Lord: ... opposite to the very essentials and fundamentals of the nature of a civil magistracy, ...

^a Matt. xiii.

which can only respect civil things : opposite to the Jews' conversion to Christ, by not permitting them a civil life or being : opposite . . to the civil peace and the lives of millions, slaughtered upon this ground, in mutual persecuting each other's conscience : . . opposite to the souls of all men who, by persecutions, are ravished into a dissembled worship which their hearts embrace not !"

From one anonymous writer,—or writers, if so they were,—we turn to another, of a very different character, called, "Some Observations and Annotations upon the 'Apologetical Narration,' Humbly Submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament ; The Most Reverend and Learned Divines of the Assembly ; And, all the Protestant Churches, here in this Island, and Abroad.—Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 71.

In the front of this work we are met with a Licensor's allowance conveying his approval of what he terms "These judicious 'Observations,' etc." as being "at this time, necessary and seasonable for the vindication of all Protestant Churches ; defending of the authority of Parliaments, and Synods ; and prevention of sad Divisions amongst ourselves ; though I reverence the Persons of the Apologists, yet, I approve to be impressed.—James Cranford."^a

The Introductory Epistle, signed "Your very loving Brother in Christ, A. S.,"^b is addressed "To the Right Reverend and Learned Divines, the Authors of the Apologetical Narration.—He tells them of the "high esteem" he ever had of their "persons," and of the "great holiness" of their "lives ;" desiring ever to be such himself as he esteems them to be, "except only" in their "particular opinions," wherein, he says, they "dissent from all Protestant, yea all Christian churches in this world !" And he enumerates among the considerations which induced him to publish, "your hard expressions against them that love and pity you ; your apparent resolution in desiring a Toleration of your religion, and consequently of a separation from our churches, which, howsoever they have power to hinder you [!] yet condescend to be suppliants to you, that you will entertain union and communion with them." A little after, he says, "yet after all these testifications of so great and tender affections towards you, ye Five men, Five Members of the Assembly,—by whose counsel and instigation, or upon what motions we know not,—joined yourselves in a particular combination ; without the knowledge of either Parliament or Assembly, to draw up and publish unto the world an 'Apologetical Narration,' as ye term it ; containing, in effect, howsoever ye name it, a singular desire of Separation from them that so cherish you ; with some unworthy nicknames ye put upon them who style you by no worse names than 'Brethren.' By such

^a James Cranford, A.M., was Rector of St. Christopher's, near the Old Exchange ; and, according to Whitelock's Memorials, p. 144, incurred the heavy censure of the House of Commons, for a political charge against some of its Members.

^b These initials are attributed, in "The Life of John Goodwin, A.M., by Thomas Jackson, 1822," 8vo, p. 116, to Dr. Adam Stewart [Steuart], who wrote "An Answer to 'A Cool Conference between the Scottish Commissioners' Cleared Reformation,' and the Holland Ministers' 'Apologetical Narration ;' brought together by a Well-Wisher to both. Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 18.

proceedings what else have ye done, but erected . . . in one word, an Assembly to overthrow the Assembly?" He terminates the Epistle with these words, "My main aim has been God's glory, and the edification of weak Brethren who may have been misled by your most learned discourse; esteeming, that during the rest of my pilgrimage, which cannot be long, having no other thing to do, I shall do well to do this, and so improve my talent to His glory, the edification of the church, and the salvation of my own soul; and so I remain,—Your very loving Brother in Christ, A. S."

Nine "General Considerations" follow the Epistle; the fifth of which contains the remark that the Narration "is commonly thought to be particularly intended" against the Scots, who at this very time, "according to their duty, hazard their lives and estates for God's church, all this kingdom, and you also." Many, he writes in the seventh, are desirous to know "Whether this 'Apologetical Narration' published by you Five alone, be published in the name of you Five alone, or of all those also, or a part of those, whom ye pretend to hold your 'tenets?' To the end, we may know in what esteem to have it. And, if in the name of you Five only, the promoters and contrivers thereof, Whether ye Five can arrogate a power unto yourselves, to maintain these 'tenets,' as the constant opinion of all your churches, having no general Confession of their Faith thereabout? If in the name of all the rest; we desire you would show your commission from all your churches, by what authority ye do it? Or if ye do it on that commission and authority from them, If that be not to assume unto yourselves a greater 'authoritative power,' than that ye call Presbyterial? Yea, than ever was the Episcopal?"

Among his "Annotations" A. S. notices, in course, the passage in the "Narration," where it is stated by its authors, that they had "no preferment or worldly respects" to shape their opinions for. On this, he put several queries, one being "What 'preferment' or 'worldly respects' could they have, that refused them when they were offered unto them, and preferred death and perpetual exile, before good fat Bishoprics?" Adding, "We know king James's round answer when some asked him 'Wherefore he preferred not good men to bishoprics? The devil an honest man,' says he, 'will accept them!'"^a Nothing of any historical importance presents itself through a succession of pages, nor even of powerful reasoning; the character of the composition being carping and disputatious, with abundance of elenchs and quiddities; we may, however, stop to transcribe what this writer thought of the Apologists, "That they condemn not others who approve of set Forms of Prayers 'prescribed,' and the 'Liturgy.' But whether these of New England," he tells us, "and others of their profession, will not condemn them in this, we know not. I wish that this were not added rather in a compliance with the present time than otherwise!"^b

The Apologists had said that nothing was written to show "a clear patent" from Christ for authoritative Classical Government,^c before those books written by two Divines of Scotland, one of England, and others of Holland. "Here ye mistake," says A. S., "for we can produce you sundry others of good note, here printed in London. We

^a P. 11.^b P. 25.^c Ap. Nar. p. 15.

are sorry ye have not seen them, or disdained to read them. If there were not many written 'before' those, it was in pity of your affliction, Neither thought they your party so considerable: neither were your opinions much known or published abroad; being only written in English, and not in Latin, except by one or two of your Divines, for anything I know. Neither thought they that ye were so averse from their Discipline, as ye appear in this Assembly; but that ye suffered only for not conforming yourselves unto Episcopal Government."^a

He tells them, that reasons dependent on the charge against "Congregational Government,"^b that there is "no allowed sufficient remedy" for various evils, induced his side to think, "That these reasons, within these two years, have made you to refine your opinion, and to mould some new solutions, and to suit your opinions more close to the current of the time than you were wont to do."^c

"As for myself," he writes, "I believe truly, that ye be very learned, pious, and honest men; and howsoever ye may fail by infirmity, yet believe I not that ye err out of malice; and, consequently, that ye are no Schismatics hitherto. And I hope and am confident, that God will not permit that so good and godly men fall away from his church. And this I say by moral probability, because of the good opinion I have conceived of you by good men's relations, and some observation of your carriages in the small conversation I have had with some of you."^d

"You disclaim not 'Brownism and their opinions' absolutely, but with a restriction and *secundum quid*; videlicet, 'as they have stated and maintained them.'^e By another limitation, namely, that ye 'differ much from them,'^f not *in re*, *sed in modo rei*, it may be, ye hold and maintain the same 'opinions,' but not in the same 'way!'"^g "Ye also declare what ye confess and 'believe,' namely, 'the truth to lie in a middle way betwixt Brownism, and the authoritative Presbyterian Government,' But this is nothing but your error. Verity consisteth not in the 'middle' of this or that which ye imagine; but in a conformity of our conceptions with their object and due measure; which, in this matter, is only God's Word revealed in the holy Scriptures. And, according to this rule, I take Presbyterian Government rather to be the 'middle' betwixt Popish tyranny and Independent anarchy."^h

As a specimen of this writer's analogical reasoning, this single position may suffice, "God in the Old Testament granted no Toleration of divers religions, or disciplines; and the New Testament requireth no less union amongst Christians than the Old amongst the Jews!"ⁱ

On the place where the Apologists complain of calumnies and reproaches cast upon their persons, and that their "silence" was interpreted that they were either "ashamed" of their opinions, or able to say but little for them;^k their present opponent answers, "If any man hath uttered any such expressions out of malice, or contempt of your persons, they are to be blamed: If out of zeal to the truth, and of the good opinion they have of you, I believe ye will not blame them; for all good men esteem you to be very godly men; and no men of learning

^a P. 36.^b Ap. Nar. 15.^c P. 37.^d P. 56.^e Ap. Nar. p. 23.^f *Ib.* p. 24.^g P. 60.^h P. 61.ⁱ P. 62.^k Ap. Nar. p. 25.

know you, but know you to be very learned men, as some of your books testify abundantly. But if 'little' can be said, to the purpose, for that cause which ye maintain, what marvel is it, that ye can 'say little' for it? Neither can honest men doubt but an ill man can and will say more for it than all ye Five can say, so soon as ye have considered it more profoundly, and the better men ye be, the less ye will have to say! Ye are not so able to maintain an ill cause, as an ill man [is]"^a "The two Houses would never recommend men thither, either ignorant or vicious, but the learnedest and godliest of the kingdom; so this your Apology is unseasonable. Only this needs an apology, That being 'Members of the Assembly,' ye will not submit yourselves unto the Assembly of Divines, but take odd ways, proper to you Five alone, to publish particular Apologies, and desire a particular Toleration; which no other 'Members of the Assembly' do. But as for this, *transeat cum cæteris erroribus*."^b "Ye excuse yourselves from false 'doctrine;' ^c whereof, no man accuseth you."^d That this piece^e was not suffered to pass unnoticed, will be seen in the appropriate place.

CHAP. XLIX.

BAILLIE.—COTTON'S "KEYS."—SION'S VIRGINS.

IN the forty-sixth chapter, we availed ourselves of some of the published confidential relations and sentiments of Robert Baillie, and we dismissed him there,^f under the influence of foreboded apprehension. It has been seen, in the interval, what other disputants were employed upon; the dependent matters being kept in useful contiguity. On returning, to connect and continue in orderly succession, further details of practices and information exposed and recorded by the Scottish conspirator, we find him stating, that "Sundry things were in hands, but nothing in readiness to come in public; for this reason, among others,

^a P. 66.

^b P. 69.

^c Ap. Nar. p. 28.

^d P. 70.

^e Other pieces bearing the name of "Adam Steuart," are—

"Zerubbabel to Sanballat and Tobiah: Or, The First Part of the Duply to M.S. *alias* Two Brethren.—*Imprim.* Mar. 17, 1644." 4to.

"The Second Part of the Duply to M.S. *alias* Two Brethren: Wherein are maintained, The King's, Parliament's, and all Civil Magistrates' Authority about the Church. Subordination of Ecclesiastical Judicatories: *refuted*, Independency of Particular Congregations. The Licentiousness of wicked Conscience, and Toleration of all sorts of most detestable Schisms, Heresies, and Religions; as Idolatry, Paganism, Turcism, Judaism, Arianism, Brownism, Anabaptism, &c., which M.S. maintain in their Books.—With a Brief Epitome and Refutation of all the whole Independent Government. Most Humbly submitted to the King's Most Excellent Majesty: To the Most Honourable Houses of Parliament: The Most Reverend and Learned Divines of the Assembly: And all the Protestant Churches in this Island and Abroad.—Oct. 3, 1644. *Imprim.* Ja. Cranford.—Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 194.

There was published also in 1644, "A Short Answer to the Second Part of his overgrown 'Duply to the Two Brethren.'" 4to.

^f See back, p. 220.

many were the more willing to have the Assembly adjourned for the holidays of Zuil [Christmas], much against our minds. . . Yet we prevailed with our friends of the lower house, to carry it so in Parliament, that both houses did profane that holy day, by sitting on it, to our joy, and some of the Assembly's shame." ^a

"One of the committee-matters," he continues, "is the Psalter. . . Mr. Nye spake much against a tie to any psalter, and something against the singing of paraphrases, as of preaching of homilies. We, *under-hand*, will mightily oppose it; for the Psalter is a great part of our uniformity, which we cannot let pass till our church be well advised with it." ^b

"Some of the Anabaptists came to the Assembly's Scribe with a Letter, inveighing against our Covenant, and carrying with them a printed sheet of 'Admonitions to the Assembly' from an old English Anabaptist at Amsterdam, to give a full liberty of conscience to all sects, and to beware of keeping any Sabbath, and such like. The Scribe offered to read all in the Assembly. Here rose a quick enough debate. Goodwin, Nye, and their party, by all means pressing the neglect, contempt, and suppressing all such fantastic papers: others were as vehement for the taking notice of them, that the Parliament might be acquaint therewith, to see to the remedy of these dangerous sects. The matter was left to be considered as the committees should think fit; but many marvelled at Goodwin and Nye's vehemency in that matter. Yet the day following, their passion gave greater offence. We were called out before twelve, to dine with old Sir Henry Vane. . . The question came, What should follow the Widows? There were left some branches of the apostles and evangelists' duties yet undiscussed. We thought these questions needless, and wished they had been passed; but sundry, by all means would have them in, of design to have the dependency of particular congregations from the apostles in matters of ordination and jurisdiction determined. The Independents, foreseeing the prejudice such a determination might bring to their cause, by all means strove to decline that dispute; as indeed it is marked by all, that to the uttermost of their power, hitherto they have studied procrastination of all things, finding that by time they gained [!] We indeed did not much care for delays, till the breath of our *army* might blow upon us some more favour and strength. However, that day, we being gone, the one party pressing the debate of 'the apostles' power over congregations;' the other, sharply declining, there fell in betwixt Goodwin and Burgess hotter words than were expected from Goodwin. Mr. Marshall composed all so well as he could. Men's humours, opinions, engagements, are so far different, that I am afraid for the issue. We doubt not to carry all in the Assembly and Parliament clearly according to our mind; but if we carry not the Independents with us, there will be ground laid for a very troublesome schism. Always it is our care to use our utmost endeavours to prevent that dangerous evil; and in this our purpose, above any other, we had need help of your prayers." ^c

^a Let. 41, "For Scotland" Jan. 1. 1644. P. 411.

^b *Ibid.*

^c P. 412.

"We had, as I wrote, obtained a sub-committee of five to join with us for preparing to the great committee some materials for a Directory. At our first meeting, for the first hour, we made pretty progress, to see what should be the work of an ordinary Sabbath, separate from fasts, communions, baptisms, marriage. Here came the first question, about Readers. . . Always these of best note about London are now in use, in the desk, to pray, and read in the Sunday morning four chapters, and expone [expound] some of them; and cause sing two psalms, and then go to the pulpit to preach. We are not against the minister's reading and expounding when he does not preach: we fear [lest] it put preaching in a more narrow and discreditable room than we could wish, if all this work be laid on the minister before he preach. . . As for the minister's bowing in the pulpit, we did misken it [let it alone]; for, besides the Independents' vehemency against it, there is no such custom here used by any. . . While we are sweetly debating, . . in came Mr. Goodwin, who, incontinent, essayed to turn all upside down, to reason against all Directories. . . All these our debates, private and public, I have in writ. . . The most of all the Assembly write; as, also, all the people almost, men, women, and children, write at preaching. . . He troubled us so, that after long debates we could conclude nothing. For the help of this evil, we thought it best to speak with him in private; so we invited him to dinner, and spent an afternoon with him very sweetly. It were a thousand pities of that man; he is of many excellent parts."^a

"Fail not," adds the subtle writer, in a letter to his cousin Spang, bearing the date of the foregoing, "when our Letters come, as quickly they will, to obtain from your folk, and if ye can, from these of Switzerland, France, and Geneva, a grave and weighty admonition to this Assembly, to be careful to suppress all schismatics, and the mother and foster[er] of all, the independency of congregations. This counsel will be very seasonable, and will be well taken, I assure you, both by Parliament and Assembly, and all, except some few who are guilty of the fault."^b

In the next, "To Scotland," he tells them, "In the debating of a proposition, anent [concerning] the Pastor's power to judge who was meet to be admitted to the Table, and who to be excluded, and who to be excommunicated; there were sundry weighty questions stated, especially that of excommunication, by Mr. Selden, avowing, with Erastus, that there is no such censure in Scripture, and what it was, was merely civil: also, that of suspension from the sacrament; the Independents denying the lawfulness of all such censures. . . And at last, the committee gave in their propositions anent Ordination. . . To day the debate will begin: the Independents, holding off with long weapons, and debating all things too prolixly which come within twenty miles of their quarters, were taken up sundry times somewhat sharply, both by divines and parliament-men; to whom their replies ever were quick and high, at will. At last, foreseeing that they behoved, ere long, to come to the point, they put out in print, on a sudden, 'An Apologetic Narration' of their

^a P. 413.—"Mr Rutherford's other large book against the Independents is in the press, and will do good." *Ibid.*

^b Let. 42. p. 419.

way, which had long lien ready beside them ; wherein they petition the Parliament, in a most sly and cunning way, for a Toleration ; and withal, lend too bold wipes to all the Reformed churches, as imperfect yet in their reformation, while their new model be embraced, which they set out so well as they are able. This piece, abruptly they presented to the Assembly ; giving to every member a copy : also they gave books to some of either house. That same day, they invited us, and some principal men of the Assembly, to a very great feast, when we had not read their book, so no word of that matter was betwixt us ; but so soon as we looked on it, we were mightily displeased therewith, and so were the most of the Assembly, and we found a necessity to answer it, for the vindication of our church from their aspersions. What both we and others shall reply, ye will hear ere long in print. The thing itself coming out at this time, was very apt to have kindled a fire ; and it seems both the devil and some men intended it, to contribute to the very wicked plot at that same instant a-working, but shortly after discovered almost miraculously.^a Yet, God, who overpowers both devils and men, I hope shall turn that engine upon the face of its crafty contrivers, and make it advantageous for our cause.”^b

“ Being wearied with the length of their proceedings, and foreseeing an appearance of a breach with the Independents, we used all the means we could, while the weather was fair, to put them to the spurs. . . We wrote a common Letter to the commission of our church, desiring a Letter from them to us, for putting us to more speed, in such terms as we might show it to the Assembly. . . Likewise, we pressed the sub-committee, to go on in the Directory. At that meeting, Mr. Goodwin brought Mr. Nye with him ; which we thought an impudent intrusion, but took no notice of it.”^c

“ Manchester, in our Synod, in the name of the Lords, did move to expedite the point of Ordination, that so gracious youths who so long

^a Called Sir Basil Brook’s, or the Oxford plot.—“ The ways of the Court are desperately irritative ; and if they continue a little, may have more dangerous effects for the contrivers than ever. The plottings are incessant. They thought to have given us a new-year’s gift, which God in his great goodness, at the very nick, did prevent. . . There was much speech also of the Independents treating at Oxford at the same time. I know they have offers from the Court of all they require.” P. 423, 424. “ My Lord Lovelace offered, in the King’s name, all Sir Harry [Vane the younger] could require to his person and party ; withal assuring that many were making their peace at Oxford, especially one for himself, and all tender consciences ; that is, my Lord Say, for himself, and the Independents.” P. 427. Another, called Ogle’s plot, is described in this Letter, p. 428.

^b Let. 43. Feb. 18, 1644. p. 420, under date, *ante* Jan. 3.—“ The other day, His Excellency, my Lord Essex, came to the Assembly, . . where, after he had given his oath, as the form is . . he was welcomed by an harangue from the prolocutor. We had so contrived it with my Lord Wharton, that the Lords that day did petition [!] the Assembly [that] they might have one of the divines to attend their house for a week, as it came about, to pray to God with them. Some days thereafter the lower house petitioned [!] for the same. Both their desires were gladly granted ; for by this means, the relics of the Service-book which, till then, was every day used in both houses, are at last banished. Paul’s and Westminster are purged of their images, organs, and all which gave offence. My Lord Manchester made two fair bonfires of such trinkets at Cambridge.” P. 421.

^c *Ibid.* p. 421, 422.

have expected, may be admitted. A committee drew up two propositions for that end: 1. That in extraordinary cases, something extraordinary might be done; keeping always so near to the rule as may be: 2. That for the present necessity, the ministers of London may be appointed by the houses of parliament, to ordain ministers for London. The Independents, do what we are all able, have kept us debating these fourteen days on these two propositions; but little to their advantage, for I hope this day shall conclude the propositions. And now all the world proclaims in their faces, that they, and they only, have been the retarders of the Assembly, to the evident hazard of the church's safety, which will not be much longer suffered."^a

"After our fourteen days' debate, for a present way of Ordination; . . . when we were ready to conclude it, upon my Lord Say's harangue, and vehement desire, it was laid aside; and . . . we fell on the long-wished for subject of the Presbytery: whereupon we have been skirmishing ever since. The proposition we stick on is, That no particular congregation may be under the government of one classical presbytery. The Independents agree for the negative. But finding that all they brought yet, was but vellications on quiddities, the most was impatient of their ways; so much the more as, this day, being pressed to answer to the Scriptures which the committee had given in for the affirmative, they were obstinate to end first their negative. They promised at last, to come to their Scriptural objections; but would not name their Scriptures before hand: by this the most took them rather to seek vantage and victory, than the truth in so ingenuous a way as they professed. However, the matter cannot take long debate.

"The heat and clamorous confusion of this Assembly is, oftentimes, greater than with us. The reason, I think, is their way, both in Assembly and parliament, to divest the Speaker, and Prolocutor, of all authority, and turn them to a very and mere chair[man], as they call them.

"We mind yet again to essay the Independents in a privy conference, if we can draw them to a reasonable accommodation; for, to that Toleration they aim at, we cannot consent. . . The Anabaptists and Antinomians increase; which yet cannot be helped."^b

"How great things are presently in hand! The highest affairs, both of church and state, being now in agitation; the diligence and power both of devils and all kinds of human enemies, being in their extreme bent-sail of opposition, either now or never to overthrow *us*. . . It is said, these of Oxford are so far fallen as to acknowledge the parliament at Westminster, and to put down Episcopacy, and to disclaim the cessation of Ireland. If our march to Newcastle has procured thus much, I hope our taking of it shall obtain the rest. . . A course will be shortly taken with all sectaries, and is begun already. The disorders which are, at this time, in New England, will make the Independents more willing to accommodate and comply with us."^c

^a P. 430.

^b P. 430, 431.

^c P. 433, 434.—In p. 430, of this long Letter, or Journal, Baillie says, "Canterbury [Laud] every week is before the lords, for his trial; but we have so much to do; and he is a person now so contemptible; that we take no notice of his process."

We revert, at this place, to the companion piece noticed in our forty-third chapter;^a because some particulars are contained in the preliminary address "To the Reader," subscribed by the English publishers, pertinent to some of those copied from Baillie, who, by the bye, has not yet alluded to this tract, intituled "The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and Power thereof, According to the Word of God. By that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. John Cotton, Teacher of the Church at Boston in New England. Tending to reconcile some present Differences about Discipline.—Published by Tho. Goodwin and Philip Nye. 1644." 4to. pp. 59.^b

"The greatest commotions in kingdoms," say these editorial invincibles, "have, for the most part, been raised and maintained for and about Power and Liberties of the Rulers and Ruled. . . And the like hath fallen out in churches; and is continued to this day, in the sharpest contentions,—though now the seat of the war is changed,—Who should be the first adequate and complete subject of that Church-power which Christ hath left on earth: how bounded, and to whom committed. This controversy is, in a special manner, the lot of these present times. And now, that most parties that can pretend anything towards it, have, in several ages, had their turns and vicissitudes of so long a possession of it; and, that their pleas for their several pretences have been so much and so long heard; it may well be hoped it is near determining, and that Christ will, shortly, settle this Power upon the right heirs, to whom he primitively did bequeath it.

"In those former darker times, this *golden Ball*^c was thrown up by the Clergy—so called—alone to run for among themselves. And as they quietly possessed the name *κληρως*—The Clergy, and [that] of 'Church' appropriated to themselves; so answerably, all manner of interest in Power, or cognizance of matters of the church, was wholly left and quitted to them: while the People, that knew not the law, having given up their souls to an implicit faith in what was to be believed, did much more suffer themselves to be deprived of [all] liberties in church-affairs. And this royal donation, bestowed by Christ upon his church, was taken up and placed in the [so] high Thrones of bishops, popes, general-councils, etc., not only far above these things on earth—the People; but things in heaven also,—we mean the angels and ministers of the churches themselves,—in so great a remoteness from the People, that the least right or interest therein, was not so much as suspected to belong to them. But towards these latter times, after many removals of it down again; and this as the issue of many suits again and again renewed and removed, and upon the sentence—even of whole states—as often reversed; it hath now, in these our days, been brought so near unto the People, that they also have begun to plead and sue for a share, portion, and legacy, bequeathed them in it; the saints, in these knowing times, finding, that 'the key of knowledge'^d hath so far opened their hearts, that they see, with their own eyes, into the substantials of godliness; and that, through the instruction and guidance of their teachers,

^a See back, p. 163.

^b And, in the same year, "A second time imprinted:" also, pp. 59.

^c A play upon the name of the author of the "Friendly Trial." ^d Luke xi. 52.

[they] are enabled to understand for themselves such other things as they are to join in [the] practice of: [they do, therefore, further, many of them, begin more than to suspect that some share in the Key of Power should, likewise, appertain unto them.]^a

“ It was the unhappiness of those who first, in these latter times, revived this plea of the People’s right, to err on the other extreme,—as it hath ever been the fate of Truth, when it first ariseth, in the church, from under that long night of darkness which antichristianism had brought upon the world, to have a long shadow of error to accompany it,—by laying the plea and claim, on their behalf, unto the whole power; and that the Elders set over them did but exercise that power for them: which was, properly, theirs; and which Christ had, as they contended, radically and originally estated in the People only!

“ But, after that all titles have been pleaded of those that are content with nothing but the whole, the final judgment and sentence may, possibly, fall to be a suitable and due proportioned distribution and dispersion of this Power into several interests, and the whole to neither part.

“ In Commonwealths, it is a dispersion of several portions of power and rights into several hands, jointly to concur and agree in acts and process of weight and moment, which causeth that healthful *κρᾶσις* and constitution of them which makes them lasting, and preserves their peace; when none, of all sorts, find they are excluded, but that, as they have a share of concernment, so a fit measure of Power, or privilege, is left and betruſted to them. And, accordingly, the wisdom of the first constitutors of commonwealths is most seen in such a just balancing of power and privileges; and besides also, in setting the exact limits of that which is committed unto each: yea, and is more admired by us in this than in their other laws. And in experience, a clear and distinct definition and confinement of all such parcels of Power—both for the kind and extent of them—is judged to be as essentially necessary, if not more, than whatever other statutes that set out the kinds and degrees of crimes or penalties.

“ So, in that Polity, or Government, by which Christ would have his churches ordered, the right disposal of the power therein—we humbly suppose—may lie in a due and proportioned allotment and dispersion, though not in the same measure and degree, into divers hands; according unto the several concernments and interests that each rank, in his church, may have; rather than in an entire and sole trust committed to any one man, though never so able; or any one sort or kind of men or officers, although diversified into never so many subordinations under one another. And, in like manner, we cannot but imagine that Christ hath been as exact in setting forth the true bounds and limits of whatever portion of Power he hath imparted unto any—if we, of this age, could attain rightly to discern it—as he hath been in ordering what kind of Censures, and for what sins; and what degrees of proceedings unto those censures; which we find he hath been punctual in.

“ Now, the scope which this grave and judicious Author, in this his treatise, doth pursue, is to lay forth the just lines and *terriers* of this

^a Added, in Edit. 2nd.

division of Church-power unto all the several subjects of it; to the end, to allay the contentions now on foot about it. And in general, he lays this fundamental maxim that holds, in common, true of all the particulars to whom any portion of Power can be supposed to be committed, That, look, whatever power or right any of the possessors and subjects thereof may have, they have it, each alike, immediately—that is, in respect of a mediation of delegation or dependence on each other—from Christ; and so, are each, the first subjects of that power that is allotted to them! And for the particular subjects themselves, he follows that division... which the controversy hath made, ... to wit, What power each, single, congregation—which is endowed with a charter to be a body-politic to Christ—hath granted to it, to exercise within itself: and, What measure, or rather, kind, of power, Christ hath placed in neighbour-churches without it, and in association with it.

“ For the first; as he supposeth each congregation such as to have the privilege of enjoying a Presbytery—or company of more or less Elders, proper unto itself; so, being thus presbyterated, he asserteth this incorporate body or society, to be the first and primary subject of a complete and entire Power, within itself, over its own members; yea, and the sole native subject of the power of ordination, and excommunication, which is the highest censure. And, whereas this corporation consisteth both of Elders and Brethren,—for, as for women and children, there is a special exception, by a statute-law of Christ, against their enjoyment of any part of this public power; his scope is, to demonstrate a distinct and several share and interest of power, in matters of common concernment, vouchsafed to each, and dispersed among both, by charter from the Lord. . . And, because these particular congregations, both Elders and People, may disagree and miscarry, and abuse this power committed to them; he, therefore, secondly, asserteth an association [or communion] of churches, sending their elders and messengers into a Synod,—so he, purposely, chooseth to style those Assemblies of Elders which the Reformed churches do call Classes, or Presbyteries, that so he might distinguish them from those presbyteries of congregations before mentioned;—and . . . [acknowledgeth] that it is an ordinance of Christ, unto whom Christ hath,—in relation to rectifying mal-administrations and healing dissensions in particular congregations, and the like cases,—committed a due and just measure of power suited and proportioned to those ends, and furnished them not only with ability to give counsel and advice, but, further, [upon such occasions] with a ministerial power and authority to determine, declare, and enjoin, such things as may tend to the reducing such congregations to right order and peace. Only in his bounding and defining this power, he affirms it to be, both for the kind and quality of it, but a dogmatical or doctrinal power—though stamped with authority ministerial, as an ordinance of Christ,—[whether] in judging of controversies of faith—[when they] disturb the peace of particular congregations, and, [which] themselves find, too difficult for them,—[or, in] discerning matters of fact, and what censures they do deserve; but, not armed with authority and power of excommunicating, or delivering unto Satan, either the congregations or the members of them: but they, in such

cases, having declared and judged the nature of the offence, and admonished the peccant churches, and discerned what they ought to do with their offending members, are to leave the formal act of this censure to that authority which can only execute it, placed by Christ in those churches themselves; which, if they deny to do, or persist in their miscarriage, then to determine to withdraw communion from them. And, also, for the extent of this power in such assemblies, and association of churches; he limits and confines that also unto cases, and with cautions, . . . to wit, That they should not intrench or impair the privilege of entire jurisdiction, committed unto each congregation,—as a liberty purchased them by Christ's blood,—but to leave them free to the exercise and use thereof, until they abuse that power, or are unable to manage it; and in that case only, to assist, guide, and direct them, and not to take on them[selves] to administer it for them, but with them, and by them.

“As for ourselves, we are yet neither afraid nor ashamed to make profession—in the midst of all the high waves on both sides dashing on us,—that the substance of this brief extract [summary] from the Author's larger discourse, is that very ‘middle-way’ which, in our ‘Apology,’^a we did in the general intimate and intend, between that which is called ‘Brownism,’ and the Presbyterial-government as it is practised. Whereof the one doth, in effect, put the chief, if not the whole, of the rule and government into the hands of the People, and drowns the Elders' votes, who are but a few, in the major part of theirs; and the other, taking the chief and the principal parts of that rule—which we conceive is the due of each congregation, the elders and brethren,—into this jurisdiction of a common presbytery of several congregations, doth thereby, in like manner, swallow up not only the interests of the people, but even the votes of the elders of that congregation concerned, in the major part thereof.

“Neither let it seem arrogance in us, but a testimony rather to the truth, further to remonstrate that this very boundary-platform and disposement of church-power, as here it is,—we speak for the substance of it,—set out and stated; as, also, that the tenure and exercise thereof in all these subjects, should be immediately from Christ unto them all; is not now new unto our thoughts. Yea, it is no other than what our own . . . apprehensions have been moulded unto long since. And this, many of our friends, and some that are of a differing opinion, having known our private judgments long, as likewise, our own notes and transcripts written long ago, can testify; besides many public professions since, as occasion hath been offered. Insomuch, as when we first read this of this learned Author,—knowing what hath been the more general current both of the practice and judgment, of our brethren for the Congregational-way,—we confess we were filled with wonderment at that Divine hand that had [thus] led the judgments—without the least mutual interchange or intimation of thoughts or notions in these particulars,—of our brethren there,^b and ourselves, unworthy to be mentioned with them here. Only we crave leave of the

^a See Lack, p. 228.

^b America.

Reverend Author, and those brethren that had the view of it, to declare that we assent not to all expressions scattered up and down, or all and every assertion interwoven in it: yea, nor to all the grounds or allegations of Scriptures; nor should we have, in all things, perhaps, used the same terms to express the same materials by.

“For instance; we humbly conceive ‘prophesying,’ as the Scripture terms it, or speaking to the edification of the whole church, may, sometimes, be performed by brethren, gifted, though not in office, as elders of the church; only, first, occasionally; not in an ordinary course: secondly, by men of such abilities as are fit for office: and, thirdly, not assuming this of themselves; but judged such by those that have the power, and so allowed and designed to it: and, fourthly, so as their doctrine be subjected, for the judging of it, in an especial manner, to the Teaching Elders of that church. And when it is thus cautioned, we see no more incongruity for such, to speak to a point of divinity in a congregation, than for men of like abilities to speak to and debate of matters of religion in an Assembly of Divines; which this Reverend Author allows, and here, with us, is practised!

“Again; in all humility; we yet see not that assembly of apostles, elders, and brethren, Acts xv., to have been a formal synod of messengers sent out of a set and combined association from neighbour churches; but an assembly of the church of Jerusalem and of the messengers from the church of Antioch alone... It may be observed, with what a wary eye, and exact aim, he [the learned Author] takes the latitude and elevation of that Power there held forth; not daring to attribute the least, either for kind or degree, than what that example warrants; which was, at utmost, but a doctrinal discernment both of the truth of that controversy they were consulted in, as also the matter of fact in those that had taught the contrary;... without so much as brandishing the sword and power of excommunication, against those... that should not obey them [in] that epistle.

“Only, in the last place; for the further clearing the difference of the People’s interest,—which the Reverend Author usually calleth ‘liberty,’ sometimes ‘power,’—and the Elders’ rule and authority;... we take the boldness to cast a weak beam of our dim light upon either of these... We conceive the ‘Elders and Brethren,’ in each congregation, as they are usually in the New Testament thus mentioned distinctly apart; and this, when their meeting together is spoken of; so they make, in each congregation, two distinct interests;... so as, without the consent and concurrence of both, nothing is esteemed as a church act: but so as, in this company of Elders, this power is properly, authority; but in the People, [there] is a privilege, or power... The like difference would appear, if we had seen a [civil] government tempered of an aristocracy and democracy; in which, suppose the People have a share, and their actual consent is necessary to all laws and sentences: whereas a few Nobles that are set over them,—whose concernment is less general,—in whom, the formal sanction of all, should lie; in these, it were rule and authority; in that multitude, but power and interest: and such an authority is to be given to a presbytery of elders in a particular congregation, or else,—as we have, long since, been

resolved,—all that is said in the New Testament about their rule, and of the People's obedience to them, is to be looked upon but as metaphors, and to hold no proportion with any substantial reality of rule and government. And in this distribution of power, Christ hath had a suitable and due regard unto the estate and condition of his Church, as now, under the New Testament, he hath qualified and dignified it. . .

“We need not enlarge the application of this. Although a greater assembly of elders are to be revered as more wise and able, than a few elders with their single congregations, and accordingly may have a higher doctrinal power,—a power properly and peculiarly suited to their abilities,—in cases of difficulty, to determine and direct congregations in their way; yet Christ hath not intrusted them with that power he hath done the congregations: because they are abstracted from the people! And so, one tribe of men, concerned in all the forementioned respects, is wanting; which Christ would have personally concurring, not by delegation or representation alone; not to the execution only, but even to the legal sentence also, of cutting men off. . . And, the higher and the greater, the association of the presbyteries are, the further are they removed from the people. . .

“Other considerations of like weight ought here to be added, . . but we should too much exceed the bounds of an Epistle.”

We are almost precluded, by this long exposition of the Reverend Publishers, from presenting a view of Cotton's method in his own words. The first chapter,—“What the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven be; and, what their Power,”—opens thus: “‘The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven’ are promised by the Lord Jesus; the Head and King of his Church; unto Peter, Matt. xvi. 19. The words being allegorical, are therefore somewhat obscure; and, holding forth honour and power in the church, are therefore controversial: for where there is no honour, nor pride to pursue it, there is no contention!” He then analyzes the text, and arrives at the “busy question, How Peter is to be considered in receiving this Power of the Keys: whether as an apostle; or as an elder;^a or as a believer, professing his faith before the Lord Jesus, and his fellow brethren? Now,” says the author, “because we are as well studious of peace as of truth, we will not lean to one of these interpretations more than to another. Take any of them; it will not hinder our purpose, in this ensuing discourse; though—to speak ingenuously, and without offence, what we conceive—the sense of the words will be most full if all the several considerations be taken jointly.” Thus he concludes; that as Peter “there received the power of an apostle, Matt. xvi. 19; so the rest of the apostles received the same power, either there or elsewhere, John xx. 20, 21, 23; and the presbytery of each church received, if not there, yet elsewhere, the power belonging to their office, Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Tim. v. 17; and in like sort, each church, or congregation, of professed believers, received that portion also of church-power which belonged to them, Matt. xviii. 17, 18.”

In the second chapter,—“Of the Distribution of the Keys,”—he takes his stand upon four particulars “defective.” For, first, both among Protestants and Papists, the “key of knowledge,” *clavis scien-*

^a 1 Pet. v. 1.

tiæ, is contradistinguished from a “key of power,” *clavis potentiæ*. Secondly, there is a real defect “in omitting” that key which belongeth to the church itself. Thirdly, there is another, “in dividing the key of order [orders] from the key of jurisdiction;” that of chancellors and commissaries, “at most, of the order of deacons only, whereof our Lord spake nothing touching jurisdiction.”^a Fourthly, “Order [orders] is appropriated to the Officers of the church only.” But “church-order,” properly understood, “is common to all the members of the church, whether officers or private brethren: there is an order, as well in them that are subject, as in them that rule; there is a *τάξις* as well *τῶν ὑποτακτικῶν* as *τῶν ἐπιτακτικῶν*” the maid, in Athenæus,^b is said *Δεραπαίνης τάξιν ἐπιλαβουσα*, as well as her mistress.

His third chapter, assigns the keys of knowledge and order. The first, which is one with the key of faith;^c “belongeth to all the faithful, whether joined to any particular church, or not. . . An Indian, or pagan, may not be received into the church till he have first received the faith and made profession of it before the Lord and the church; which argueth that ‘the key of knowledge’ is given not only to the church but to some before they enter into the church.” The other, the key of order, here,—“speaking, as we do, of church-order, as Paul doth, Col. ii. 5,—belongeth to all such who are in church-order, whether elders or brethren.”

The fourth chapter treats of the “key of church-privilege, power, or liberty.” The liberties of the “Brethren, or of the church consisting of them, are many and great.”—To choose their officers; Acts i. 15; xiv. 23; vi. 3, 5, 6:—to send forth one or more of their elders; Phil. ii. 25:—power and liberty of propounding any just exception against such as offer themselves to be admitted unto their communion, or unto the seals of it; Acts ix. 26, 27; x. 47:—as, in case of private scandals, Matt. xviii. 15, 16; so the whole church, to join with the elders, ver. 17; Acts xi. 2—18; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5, with ver. 2, 12, and vi. 1—5; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 8. “The jury by their verdict, as well as the judge by his sentence, do both of them judge the same malefactor; yet, in the jury their verdict is but an act of their popular liberty, in the judge it is an act of his judicial authority.” This power, or privilege, may reach also to an offensive elder, Acts xi. 2—18, as before; Col. iv. 17; Gal. v. 12, 13. Other liberties which the Brethren have, are, “to resort to a synod,” Acts xv. 1, 2, with ver. 7, 12; 22, 23:—to withdraw, *ἐκκλίνατε*,^d from the communion of those whom they want authority to excommunicate: “for as they set up the presbytery by professing subjection to them, in the Lord; so they ‘avoid’ them by professed withdrawing their subjection from them, according to God:”—and, lastly, liberty of communion “with other churches;” by way of participation; recommendation; consultation; congregation into a synod; contribution; admonition; propagation, or multiplication of churches. “Though the apostles be dead, whose office it was to plant, and gather, and multiply, churches; yet the work is not dead,

^a “Christ hath given no jurisdiction but to whom he hath given office.” p. 10.

^b De Epicuro, lib. xi.

^c Luke xi. 52; Isai. liii. 11; John xvii. 3.

^d Rom. xvi. 17.

but the same power of the keys is left with the churches in common ; and with each particular church for her part ; according to their measure, to propagate and enlarge the kingdom of Christ, throughout all generations !”

“To whom the Key of Authority is committed,” heads the fifth chapter. Cotton adduces here, 1 Tim. v. 17, and Heb. xiii. 7, 17 ; with Tit. ii. 15, and Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. But, to found, or base, upon these texts barely, the “authority” or rule, whatever it be, which is intended under this head ; appears to us little better than a *non sequitur* ; and, granting that the “rule” imports what is, or has been, asserted of it, by whom, we ask, is the qualification, καλῶς, “well,” to be satisfactorily judged ? So, too, of ἐπιταγῆς, “authority,” in Titus ? That the ordering or management of each particular church is in the οἱ προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, those who preside over it, follows, *pro re nata*. The following passage sums up the author’s reasoning here : “The elders, to be both ‘servants,’ 2 Cor. iv. 5, and rulers of the church, may both of them stand well together ; for their ‘rule’ is not lordly, as if they ruled of themselves, or from themselves ; but stewardly and ministerial, as ruling the church from Christ, and also from their call : and withal, ruling the church for Christ ; and the church, even for their spiritual everlasting good. A queen may call her servants, her mariners, to pilot and conduct her over the sea to such a haven ; yet they being called by her to such an office, she must not rule them in steering their course, but must submit herself to be ruled by them, till they have brought her to her desired haven : so is the case between the church and her elders !”

The sixth chapter is “Of the Power and Authority given to Synods.” The Reverend publishers have enlarged so much on this place, that we shall content ourselves with the point in it which has reference to synods enjoining things, in their nature and use, “indifferent.” Cotton denies them any such power, pleaded for from Matt. xxviii. 19, 20 ; and he says, “that much urged and much abused place in 1 Cor. xiv. 40, will not reach it. For, though Paul, requiring that all the duties of God’s worship . . . should be performed ‘decently and orderly ;’ thereby, forbiddeth any performance thereof undecently . . . he doth not at all . . . enjoin such things as decent whose want, or whose contrary, is not undecent ; nor such orders, whose want, or contrary, would be no disorder. Suppose the church of Corinth,—or any other church, or synod,—should enjoin their ministers to preach in a gown : a gown is a decent garment to preach in ; yet such an injunction is not grounded upon that text ; . . . for then, a minister, in neglecting to preach in a gown, should neglect the commandment of the apostle, which yet indeed he doth not ; for if he preach in a cloak, he preacheth ‘decently’ enough, and that is all which the apostle’s canon reacheth to. In these things, Christ never provided for uniformity, but only for unity.”

The seventh [and concluding] chapter, and the longest, is headed, “Touching the first subject, of all the forementioned Power of the Keys. And an explanation of Independency.” The introductory paragraphs are devoted to the subject of the Headship of Christ. “The good pleasure of the Father ; the personal union of the human nature

with the eternal Son of God ; his purchase of his church with his own blood, and his deep humiliation of himself unto the death of the cross ; have, all of them, obtained to him this his highest exaltation, to be ' Head over all things unto the church,' Eph. i. 22, and to enjoy, as King thereof, this sovereign power. Col. i. 19 ; ii. 2, 9, 10 ; Acts xx. 28 ; Phil. ii. 8—11. But, of this *sovereign* power of Christ, there is no question amongst Protestants especially studious of reformation." Concerning the "*ministerial* power," Cotton propounds in this treatise, that "a particular church, or congregation of saints, professing the Faith ; taken, indefinitely,^a for any church—one as well as another—is the first subject of all the church-offices, with all their spiritual gifts and power, which Christ hath given to be executed amongst them. 'Whether' it be 'Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas ; . . all are yours ;' speaking to the church of Corinth, 1 Cor. iii. 22, not as a peculiar privilege unto them, but common to them with any other particular church. And, theirs was such a church, of whom it is said that they came all together 'into one place,' for the communication of their spiritual gifts, 1 Cor. xiv. 23. And Paul telleth the same church, that God hath set the officers, and their gifts, and all variety of members and their functions, in his 'church ;' xii. 28. . .

"In the New Testament, it is not a new observation that we never read of any National Church, nor of any national officers given to them by Christ. . . And yet we willingly grant, that particular churches, of equal power, may, in some cases appointed by Christ, meet together by themselves, or by their messengers, in a synod, and may perform sundry acts of power there. . . But the officers themselves, and all the brethren members of the synod, yea, and the synods themselves, and all the power they put forth ; they are all of them primarily given to the several churches of particular congregations, either as the first subject in whom they are resident, or as the first object about whom they are conversant, and for whose sake they are gathered and employed. . .

"That ample and universal latitude of power which was conjoined in the apostles, is now divided, even by themselves, amongst all the churches, and all the officers of the churches respectively ; the officers of each church attending the charge of the particular church committed to them, by virtue of their office ; and yet none of them neglecting the good of other churches, so far as they may be mutually helpful to one another in the Lord.

"When the church of a particular congregation walketh together in the Truth, and peace, the Brethren of the church are the first subject of 'church-liberty,' and the Elders thereof of 'church authority ;' and both together are the first subject of 'all church-power' needful to be exercised within themselves ; whether in the election and ordination of officers, or in the censure of offenders in their own body. . . If the Brethren . . . were not the first subject of their 'church-liberty,' then they derived it either from their own Elders, or from other churches : but they derived it not from their own elders ; for they had power and

^a The second impression reads, "independently."

liberty to choose their own elders, and therefore they had this liberty before they had elders; and so could not derive it from them! Nor did they derive it from other particular churches: for all particular churches are of equal liberty and power within themselves; not one subordinate to another. We read not in Scripture, that the church of [Cenchrea] was subject to that of Corinth, though it was a church situate in their vicinity. Nor did they derive their liberty from a synod of churches: for we found no footstep in the pattern of synods, Acts xv., that the church of Antioch borrowed any of their liberties from the synod at Jerusalem. They borrowed, indeed, light from them, and decrees, tending to the establishment of truth [faith] and peace, .. Acts xvi. 4, 5; and, also, in consolation and peace, xv. 31, 32; but they did not borrow from them any church-liberty at all...

"The elders of churches are never found in Scripture to derive their authority which they exercise in their own congregations, either from the elders of other churches, or from any synod of churches. All particular churches, and all the elders of them, are of equal power; each of them respectively in their own congregations. None of them call others their rabbies, or masters, or fathers,—in respect of any authority over them,—but all of them own and acknowledge one another as fellow brethren. Matt. xxiii. 8—10. ...

"The church is never put for the presbytery alone, throughout the New Testament; though sometimes it be put expressly for the fraternity alone, as they are distinguished from the elders and officers, Acts xv. 22; and, therefore, 'tell the church,' Matt. xviii. 17,^a cannot be meant, tell the presbytery alone! ... As a whole particular congregation may offend, so may a general assembly of all the presbyteries in a nation offend also: for general councils have erred; and what remedy shall be found, to remove such errors and offences, out of this text? ... Why may not a complaint be orderly made to a whole multitude? The Levite, Judges xx. 1—11, made an orderly complaint to a greater multitude than four hundred particular congregations are wont to amount to! ... The reproof for not proceeding to sentence sooner, is directed to the whole church [at Corinth] as well as to the presbytery; they are all blamed for not mourning, for not putting 'away' [the incestuous person]; for being 'puffed up' rather, 1 Cor. v. 2. The commandment is directed to them all, when they 'are gathered together;'—and what is that, but to a church-meeting?—to proceed against him, ver. 4. In like sort.. [the apostle] commandeth them all, ver. 13. He declareth this act of theirs in putting him out, to be a judicial act,—'Do not ye judge them that are within?' ver. 12. Say, that the judgment of authority be proper only to the presbytery; yet the judgment of discretion,—which, as concurring in this act with the presbytery, hath a power in it,—may not be denied to the Brethren; for here is an act of judgment ascribed to them all. Which judgment in the Brethren, he [the apostle] esteemeth of it so highly, that from thence he taketh occasion to advise the members of the church to refer their differences, even in civil matters, to the judgment of the 'saints,'

^a "This text, not the obscurity of the words, but the eminency of the gifts and worth of expositors, hath made difficult." P. 44.

or 'brethren : ' 'know ye not,' saith he, 'that the saints shall judge the world?' yea, the 'angels?' vi. 1—3; 'how much more, the things of this life?' Yea, rather than they should 'go to law,' and that 'before infidels,' in any case depending 'between brethren;' he adviseth them rather to set up the meanest in the church to hear and judge between them! ver. 4. When the apostle directeth them, upon the repentance of an offender, to forgive him, he speaketh to the brethren, as well as to their elders, 'to forgive him:' 2 Cor. ii. 4—10. . . That which the apostle calleth the church of [at] Corinth, even 'the whole church,' was no larger than was wont to meet together 'in one place;' one congregation, 1 Cor. xiv. 23. . . Christ hath something against 'the church of [in] Pergamos,' for suffering Balaam, and the Nicolaitanes, Rev. ii. 14, 15; and something against 'the church of [in] Thyatira,' for suffering Jezebel, ver. 20. Now, if these churches had not, either of them, sufficient power to purge out their own offenders, why are they blamed for toleration of them? Yea, why are not the neighbouring churches blamed for the sins of these churches? But we see, neither is Pergamos blamed for tolerating Jezebel, nor Thyatira for tolerating Balaam, nor Smyrna for tolerating either! Indeed, what Christ writeth to any one church, his 'Spirit' calleth all 'the churches' to hearken unto; and so he doth our churches also at this day. . . Every church of a particular congregation, being a body, even a body of Christ in itself; it were not for the honour of Christ, nor of his body, if, when it were in a sound and athletic constitution, it should not have power to purge itself of its own superfluous and noisome humours. In case a particular church be disturbed with error or scandal, and the same maintained by a faction amongst them; now, a synod of churches, or of their messengers, is the first subject of that power and authority whereby error is judicially convinced and condemned; the truth searched out and determined, and the way of truth and peace declared and imposed [enjoined?] upon the churches."

After several particulars, which we pass by, we find the author guarding his doctrine thus: "Touching this great work of Communion and Consociation of churches, give us leave to add this caution—To see that this Consociation of churches be not perverted, either to the oppression or diminution of the just liberty and authority of each particular church within itself; who, being well supplied with a faithful and expert Presbytery of their own, do walk in their integrity, according to the truth and peace of the Gospel. Let Synods have their just authority in all churches, how pure soever, in determining such *διατάξεις* as are requisite for the edification of all Christ's churches according to God. But, in the election and ordination of officers, and censure of offenders, let it suffice the churches consociate, to assist one another with their counsel and right-hand of fellowship, when they see a particular church use their liberty and power aright: but let them not put forth the power of their community, either to take such church acts out of their hands or to hinder them in their lawful course, unless they see them, through ignorance or weakness, to abuse their liberty and authority in the Gospel! All the liberties of churches were purchased to them by the precious blood of the Lord Jesus; and therefore neither

may the churches give them away, nor many churches take them out of the hands of one... The Lord Jesus having given equal power to all the apostles, it was not lawful for eleven of them to forbid the twelfth to do any act of his office without their intervention: neither was it lawful for the nine who were of inferior gifts, to commit the guidance and command of all their apostolic administrations unto Peter, James, and John, 'who seemed to be pillars,' Gal. ii. 9; and that, not only because they were all, one as well as another, immediately guided by the Holy Ghost: but because they were all equal in office, and 'every one' to 'give account for [of] himself unto God.' Rom. xiv. 12. It is the like case, in some measure, of particular churches, ... *attending* the translation of their power, in these ordinary administrations, into the hands of a synod of presbyters, commonly called a Classis!... The practice of this power of the Keys only by a synod of presbyters, still keepeth the church as under nonage; as if they were not grown up to the full fruition of the just liberty of their riper years in these days of the Gospel... And yet, in any such part of her way as may be more hard to hit right upon; as in her elections, and ordinances, and censures of eminent persons in office; it is a safe and holy and faithful office of the vigilancy of the Community of churches, to be present with them, and helpful to them in the Lord."

We proceed to notice, in the next place,—not indeed because of its connexion with what precedes it immediately, but for having made its appearance about the same time,^a—a tract of seven pages, intituled, "To Sion's Virgins: Or, A Short Form of Catechism of the Doctrine of Baptism, in use [useful] in these Times that are so full of Questions. By an Ancient Member [Elder?] of that long ago gathered Congregation, whereof Mr. Henry Jacob was an instrument of gathering it, and the Pastor 'worthy of double honour;' Mr. John *Lathroppe*, succeeding him, now Pastor in New England: and, the beloved Congregation, through God's mercies, sees her Teachers waiting when God shall give more Liberty, and Pastors according to his own heart; praying the Lord of the harvest to thrust forth Labourers into his harvest.—Printed in the year 1644." 4to.

The address "To the Reader" affords nothing historical, "What I have received," the writer says there, "by hearing and seeing, I desire to manifest in defence of the Baptism and Form we have received; not being easily moved but as Christ shall more manifest himself, which I cannot conceive to be in the dipping the head, the creature going in and out of the water: The Form of Baptism doth, more or less, hold forth Christ... Baptism declares Infants to be Virgins;^b the Supper declares Believers to be Spouses."^c

The head-line of the work is, "Queries Concerning Baptism." The following portions of the argumentation are divested of their catechetical form. The author's assumptions are, that Infants are "of the kingdom,"^d

^a It might be called forth when Mr. H. Jessey, who succeeded Mr. *Lathrop*, in 1637, "held several debates... concerning pædobaptism."—*Life of Jessey*, 1671, p. 83.—In 1645 Jessey was dipped, "though his own congregation at that time was most of them for Infant baptism."

^b [Cant. vi 8.]

^c [Eph. v. 25.]

^d Luke xviii. 16.

through the “Father’s good pleasure;”^a that they are ingredients of the “many nations” whom the Saviour shall “sprinkle;”^b that they are of the spouse, or church, “washed” in Christ’s blood,^c as were those of old, of the “vine out of Egypt,”^d even of those who were “all” baptized “in the cloud and in the sea.”^e

Baptism, under the Gospel, is the church’s office; done “in the name of the” Three, by the power or authority of Christ: they only “put on Christ” who are “baptized into,”^f or unto Christ, by the Spirit, “not all that are baptized by water.” No one is “fully” baptized without pouring, sprinkling, and washing; not dipping of the head, any more than “whole wafers” in the Supper: bread there is, but no *breaking*, showing forth Christ’s sufferings; so, “whole rivers” show not forth Christ’s sufferings, *pouring* him out like water *besprinkling* all his raiment...^h As by “their faith” who brought him to Christ, the “man sick of the palsy” was healed;ⁱ so the faith of the parents induceth them to carry their Infants to Christ’s Ordinance, “confessing original sin: believing God is their God, and the God of their seed; showing the need they [their infants] have of Christ; so leaving the infant in the house of God, to grow up in his courts at the soles of Christ’s feet.”.. “To dip an infant, there is a dim light of Christ.”.. “For a creature to go in and out of the water; the dipper to dip down the head; is no showing Christ at all.”.. “Sweating water and blood,” then was Christ “buried” by baptism! Being under the wrath of the Father, all his waves were over him: then were the elect buried with him, having communion with him in his death: when Mary came “aforehand” to anoint his body: it being manifest to believers, when they are baptized by the Spirit, dying unto sin and rising again unto “newness of life:” but, when Christ was buried by Nicodemus, in the dust, there was no need of showing forth that burial, nor his resurrection; seeing he was “seen” after his resurrection... Christ died for sin, and rose again “for our justification;” so believers die to sin, and rise to “newness of life;” justifying themselves to others that they “are risen with Christ.”

“The two seals under the Gospel, are of one nature; but washing makes *us* capable of eating: So circumcision makes [made] *them* capable of eating the passover. Then, say such as be called ‘Anabaptists,’ Why do not children eat the Supper? Children were not capable of eating the passover before they were capable of instruction; asking the parents what it meant; so, the children of the Church are not capable of the Supper before they can “examine” themselves: wherefore let such as deny Infant baptism, and go into the water and dip down the head, and come out, to show death and burial, take heed they take not the Name of the Lord in vain; more especially such as have received baptism in their infancy!”

^a Luke xii. 32.^d Psal. lxxx. 8, &c.^g Psal. xxii. 14.^b Isai. lii. 15; Ezek. xxxvi. 25.^e 1 Cor. x. 2.^h Isai. lxiii. 3.^c Rev. i. 5.^f Gal. iii. 27.ⁱ Matt. ix. 2.

CHAP. L.

PURITAN TRACT, EDITED BY RATHBAND.

AMIDST the spirit-stirring excitement distinguishing the era through which we are traversing, one of those immured or chest-bound relics, consigned to its fate through prudential considerations, was dragged forth and represented as bearing the evidences of wisdom, and a peculiar adaptation to what was become, for it, a propitious futurity: such is "A Most Grave and Modest Confutation of the Errors of the Sect commonly called 'Brownists,' or 'Separatists:' Agreed upon, long since, by the joint consent of sundry Godly and Learned Ministers of this Kingdom; then standing out and suffering in the cause of Inconformity, and now published, in a time of need, for the good of God's Church, and the better settling of men's unstable minds in the Truth against the subtle Insinuations and plausible Pretences of that Pernicious Evil.—Published by W. Rathband, Minister of the Gospel.—1644." 4to. pp. 71.

With what consistency this production appeared under the name of its publisher, will be perceived from these particulars; "Having published a book against the 'Brownists,' which Dr. Stillingfleet quoted to prove that preaching, when prohibited by the established laws, was contrary to the doctrine of all the old nonconformists; one of his sons assured Mr. Baxter, in a letter, 'That his father was not to be reckoned among those who held that sentiment; since he exercised his ministry, though contrary to law, for many years at a chapel in Lancashire; and after he was silenced, he preached in private as he had opportunity, and the times would bear.'" ^a We turn from this to the Publisher himself.

"Christian Reader; this ensuing treatise . . . was compiled, so as now thou hast it without any addition or alteration, many years since, by sundry reverend and godly ministers of this kingdom, who, in their times, stood out and suffered in the cause of inconformity to the ceremonies, and laboured the reformation of things then, and still in part, remaining amiss in our church: therein, both for opinion and practice, endeavouring to keep close to the rules of Scripture and, what in them lay, to eschew all errors and exorbitances, both of Separation on the right hand, and of Superstition on the left.

"Who the men were by name, is neither now necessary to be published, nor in respect of them all certainly known. . . . It is now presented to public view . . . the rather because, first, The Press is now more free and open . . . to books of this nature, which do so oppose the schism of the Brownists as not at all to allow of the tyranny and corruptions of the Bishops. Secondly, It seemeth now more needful than formerly, through the late lamentable increase of opinions and practices of Separation; and the dangerous rents already made and likely to be made thereby,

^a Baxter's second part of "The Nonconformists' Plea for Peace," 1680. 4to. p. 193. Quoted in Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 470.

even to the utter ruin of this Church, if, by the mercy of our God and the wisdom of our King and Parliament, some timely and effectual remedy be not provided. Thirdly, Hereby, good reader, thou mayest see that the opinions and practices of those that way addicted,—now so much extolled, wondered at, and greedily embraced by many under the notion of new truths, and a new and further light, as if some new created star had now appeared to the world never seen before!—are, indeed, no other for substance but the old errors and dotages of Barrowe and Greenwood; long since . . . exploded, save that now, like rusty weapons, they are newly furbished; and being but the same metals and materials, are only cast into a new mould, with addition of some things more of the same sort than they expressly held; mitigation of others, by them more sharply and rigorously delivered; and interlacing of others, more pleasing and plausible. . . Fourthly, Hereby, also, thou mayest perceive and take up the true judgment of the true ancient and present Nonconformists of this kingdom in these points: . . . whereof, by the help of God, thou mayest make these and the like uses: 1. Thou mayest clear them, in thy thoughts, from the misrepresentations and imputations both of the Episcopal and Schismatical parties; both of which, would make the world believe that the Nonconformists have laid the foundation of *Brownism*, by their principles of *Inconformity*; and that if *this* be lawful the *other* must needs be necessary. . . 2. Thou mayest see that the cause of Separation may be confuted without relinquishing in one part, the grounds of Inconformity, or leaning at all unto Episcopacy: as the cause of Inconformity may be fully maintained without fetching weapons from or betaking ourselves unto the camp of Separation. Which thing I could wish, with all my heart, had been well observed by some—otherwise, godly and judicious Brethren,—in these days, who no sooner begin to distaste and cast off their old burden of superstitious Conformity, of late augmented and made utterly unprofitable by sundry other innovations, but withal they begin to dislike all Set Forms of Prayer, especially in our Liturgy, as unlawful; to question their own standing in the ministry as antichristian; and to abstain from our worship, especially our sacraments, as idolatrous; with other like unreasonable opinions and practices! As if it were not possible for men to leap out of the Surplice unless also they leap out of the Church; and as if there were no middle between Separation from the Church . . . and Subscription unto, or practice or approbation of, all the corruptions in the same. An error in some sort, formerly, excusable; when ‘oppression’ and persecution made even wise men themselves ‘mad;’^a and sometimes in haste, between fear, grief, and anger, in avoiding one extreme to fall upon another: but now, since that, by the miraculous mercies of God, the stings of those great bees are pulled out, and their horns sawed off, whereby they have so long afflicted and willingly destroyed this poor Church; I say, now, methinks wise men should look before they leap. . . Lastly; Thou mayest be somewhat stayed from hasty adhering or inclining to their courses of Separation not only by the treatise itself but also by the consideration of the treatisers. . . We are sometimes almost deafened with the praises of some of the Separators’ eminent learning,

^a Eccles. vii. 7.

piety, sincerity, zeal, etc.:... I hope it need not be offensive to any.. to oppose these men's learning, piety, sincerity, zeal, etc., against the others;.. accounting it more agreeable to all rules of piety, charity, and christian prudence, to tolerate, for the time, what they could not mend; rather than to rend and tear all in pieces, to an utter ruin!

“ To conclude; though, perhaps, some few particulars in this treatise may seem more questionable, yet for the main I doubt not but the authors have held close to the truth both in their own positions and in opposing their adversaries...”

The pretensions, capabilities, and object, of the Reverend Correctors, they set forth thus, in their preface: “ We take it to be our duties, being members and ministers of this Church, having, by God's grace received some, though a small measure of gifts fit thereunto; as, to maintain the credit of the Church wherein we live, and to justify the practice of our ministry therein so far forth as truth will permit; so, chiefly to seek and endeavour both the recovery of those that are strayed from the sheep-fold of Christ among us, and also the stay of those that are ready to run after them:.. and now have bestowed our labours in writing this treatise following, to the same end; wherein, after we have proved, by certain reasons, that our Assemblies are the true Church of God, we take upon ourselves to show, 1. The four chief exceptions they take against our Church for warranting schism and separation from us, are vain and frivolous: 2. That the main grounds they stand upon for the erecting their new church, are weak and slender: 3. That the best arguments that they use for condemning us and justifying themselves, are loose and insufficient. Which points, as we have gathered out of their printed books and written papers,—where they were before scattered,—and brought into one form and body, so have we more plainly and nakedly both proposed and dealt in: passing by all impertinent and offensive matters, and their flouting declamations, petitions, exclamations, and bitter reviling speeches against our churches, ministers, and people; all their reproachful, slanderous, profane scornings, fearful blasphemies against the Word preached and sacraments administered; prayers and holy exercises of religion, used in our Assemblies; wherewith their writings and printings swell to some bigness, as bladders puffed up with wind!..

“ This work of ours we commend first unto our Brethren departed from us... We exhort them.. to try carefully, the allegations of Scripture wherewith they have fully painted the margents, and with the multitude whereof they have astonished the simple or credulous readers, persuading them that their cause standeth upon the *sure* ground of God's holy Word; and they shall plainly perceive that the places by them alleged do, for the most part, prove that which we deny not: and if they be brought to confirm the matter in controversy, they are either unconscionably or ignorantly wrested against, or besides the meaning of the Holy Ghost. A second thing which we entreat them to do is to view the persons of whom their Assemblies consist; and let them tell us how many of them there be whom *they* have brought from gross ignorance unto true knowledge, from infidelity to holy faith, from profaneness of life to a conscionable walking with God: if there be scarce any, amongst them, which have not been of some note, in *our* churches, for holy and

sincere profession : and, if they had no good thing in them which they have not received by the ministry of those men and in the bosom of those churches which, now, they condemn and fly from ; why, then, take they the seal of our ministry and church, and set it unto their blank ?..

“ A second sort to whom we commend this labour of ours, be our Brethren also, who, by the writings, doings and sufferings, of these deceived men, are in danger likewise to be deceived, being brought to halt between two opinions. . .

“ A third sort . . are our stronger Brethren, which continue with comfort in the society of their Church. . .

“ We, lastly, commend this simple travail of ours to the Church of God whereof we are unworthy ministers ; beseeching her to accept our poor endeavours, the rather for that we are not ignorant that the labours which we have taken in this cause will be diversely judged of according to the manner and affection of those men to whom this work shall come. Some, as namely our deceived Brethren, against whom we deal, will hold it damnable and execrable, as being bestowed against ‘ the church of Christ,’ against the ‘ saints and children of God,’ against the ‘ holy truth taught in the Testament of Christ.’ . . Some others, Fathers and Brethren, ministers and members with us, of this Church, . . will hold our pains requisite and necessary to stay the course of these waters which we have given passage unto, and to make up the breaches we have opened, by speaking against the Government established in this Church ; the Ceremonies used therein ; and other our unadvised dealings in the execution of our ministry !

“ To these men we say, first, that as we have been and are persuaded of the truth of these things which we have delivered touching the defects and wants, the blemishes and deformities of this Church ; so have we, in the sincerity and uprightness of our hearts, dealt for the redress and reformation thereof : wherein, though we know nothing by ourselves before men more than truth will permit, if they should have taken occasion by our doctrine . . to make this schism, yet were this no reason to reprove us, unless those men which have set down true positions, be to be blamed as authors of the false collections and conclusions which are inferred and gathered thereupon. Secondly, we answer, That our deceived Brethren do no less condemn those churches of God as the synagogues of Satan, where the doctrine which we have taught, touching the Government of the church, and matters of Ceremonies, is maintained ; and where all things which we hold offensive in our Church are abolished ; than they do the Church of England : insomuch that they have written of the Church of Geneva,—which is holden to be the best pattern of a Reformed Church,—that it became a miserable precedent and pernicious example even unto all Europe ! Whereby it is evident, that they have been brought unto this schism by some other inducements than the dealing of those men, in the execution of their ministry, who are charged to be the occasions, if not the authors thereof. Thirdly, there is such difference and plain contradiction, between them and us in judgment ; yea, in the matter of Discipline and Church-government ; besides many other material points of Doctrine ; as we marvel any man should esteem

us causes of their defections from this Church: much more, that any man should write, 'That between the Brownists and others,' he meaneth them and us, 'there is no controversy as touching the framing of a church by the Word of God!' . . .

"Whereas the work is somewhat long; . . . know that we desired to be much more brief therein than we are: . . . for that fewer words and reasons might have as well satisfied the learned sort; but whereas our desire is to satisfy the simple as having more need . . . we could not use more brevity without more obscurity. And thus we commend thee to God, and to his blessing upon the reading hereof, that it may be a means to teach thee to discern the things that differ, and to keep thee from thy being 'over-much just' lest thou become too 'wicked.'^a Amen."

The treatise is composed of four parts: namely, the thesis, that "The Church of England, is a 'true' Church of Christ:" an assumption, that "We have a 'true' Ministry in England;" another, that "Our People may be accounted members of a 'true' Visible Church:" and "The Conclusion." The books and positions controverted, almost exclusively, are those of Barrowe and Greenwood, of whom, as we have already made our readers acquainted, and are not called upon to be their apologists for too plain dealing or irreverent treatment, we shall not again concern ourselves beyond a few particulars.

We find these spiritual Censors writing thus, in their nineteenth page; which is given entire to show how they dealt with one of the embarrassments which rose in their path. "They object . . . 'That we stand under a false and antichristian Government: for that we are directed by and subject to canons, courts, and authority of the Bishops;' which they do not content themselves, in the sixty-eighth and sixty-ninth pages of their Collection of Letters and Conferences, to call 'Popish, and Antichristian, and Egyptian, and Babylonish yokes;' but in regard thereof, they say our Assemblies 'cast out Satan by the power of Satan.'

"To this, we make answer, first; Seeing it hath been already showed, that the Discipline which our Church exerciseth is, in substance, the same with that which Christ instituted, they cannot with any colour of truth say that all our church-government is 'popish and antichristian,' but only that it is popishly and corruptly administered. Secondly; Though it were confessed that in the callings and authority of the Bishops, there be divers things 'antichristian,' yet see we not how our Bishops could truly be called Antichrists, or Antichristians: because, 1. The Word, when it describeth Antichrist, and teacheth us how to know him, useth to mark him out by his false doctrine.^b Neither can we find in holy Scripture any such accounted an Antichrist, or Antichristian, who, holding the truth of doctrine, and professing all the fundamental articles of the faith, doth swerve, either in judgment or practice, from that rule which Christ hath given for the discipline of his church. Now, it is evident that our Bishops both do, and, by the laws of our land, ought to hold and teach all doctrines and truths that are fundamental: yea, some of them have, learnedly and soundly, maintained the Truth

^a Eccles. vii. 16, 17.

^b 2 Thess. ii. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 2, 3; 1 John ii. 22; iv. 3; 2 John, 7; Rev. xiii. 5, 6.

against heretics that have gainsaid it; some have not only, by their doctrine and ministry, converted many to the Truth, but have suffered persecution also for the Gospel. And, though Henry Barrowe, in the eleventh page of his *Discovery*, call them ‘pseudo-martyrs’ and ‘run-away professors,’ yet can he not prove that they all, since their accepting their rooms, renounced and are fallen from that Truth which they then suffered for. 2. Their hierarchy, and other their corruptions that are charged upon the calling of our Bishops, were rather to be esteemed as the stairs and way to Antichristianity, than Antichristianity itself; which is evident by this, that they were in the Church before the Pope,—who is the Antichrist, and the chief head-link of all Antichristianity,—was revealed. 3. The Antichristian Bishops hold their pre-eminence as from God’s law, which is unchangeable: whereas our Bishops, since her Majesty’s reign until this day, for the most part, held their superiority by no other right than by the positive law, which is variable. Yea, it appeareth both by the institution of the Courts of Delegates, and by the continuance thereof to this day, that they do, and ought by law to hold their jurisdiction not as from God, but as from the prince! Thirdly: Admit that both our Bishops and the government by them exercised were Antichristian; yet might we that stand in that sort as we do, be subject unto them that are the true Church of Christ. It is evident that, to speak properly, the yoke of Antichrist is only inward and spiritual where the faith and conscience are enjoined, upon pain of damnation, to receive other laws and worship than that which God, in his Word, prescribeth. And even to this yoke, the true church hath been often subject; or else the church of the Jews, even in the days of Christ, was no true church, that held themselves bound in conscience to observe sundry traditions of the elders. In a more large sense, those Prelates are called Antichristian that join civil jurisdiction with ecclesiastical, or usurp more than they ought in external government, or tyrannously abuse the power committed to their hands; and this Antichristian yoke also, the true Church hath borne many a time: in the days of the Maccabees there was a true church among the Jews, yet the Priests did exercise civil jurisdiction. There was a true church both in Jeremiah’s and Ezekiel’s days which yet did bear this Antichristian yoke.^a The authority which our Bishops are said to usurp over the ministers and church is not worse than that which Diotrephes usurped! for, besides that he sought for an Antichristian pre-eminence, it is evident that the church was unable to resist him, and therefore the Apostle purposed himself to come and rebuke him. Their own terms they use in this,—namely, ‘Egyptian and Babylonian yoke,’—shall teach them thus much; for, seeing that the Jews remained still the Church of God even in that bondage that they stood under in Egypt and Babylon, why may not we also remain God’s Church still, notwithstanding the yoke which we bear, being nothing so heavy as that was?”

Thus much we copy from p. 37: “Concerning Ordination by Eldership;^b this we answer in particular, That unless the Eldership be

^a Jere. v. 31; xx. 1, 2: Ezek. xxxiv. 4.

^b “That we are not chosen by that people over whom we are set, nor approved by an eldership.” P. 35.

held so essential a thing that there can be no true church without it,—which we are well assured of that our Brethren themselves, and all that have any knowledge, will deny,—ordination by the eldership cannot be absolutely necessary: albeit, in the settled government of a church, we hold it of the essence of the Calling of a minister that we [he] have the substance of the ordination appointed in the Word. *Again*: That as in times past, so now also, there may be, in some places, such an estate of the church as wherein no manner of ordination and investing of ministers hath been or could be used in the giving of an entrance into the ministry. And though, where it may be conveniently had, we hold it fit that the weakness of the people's judgment in their choice of their minister, should be supported by the discreet knowledge of the ministers and elders that are about them; yet, where it cannot be conveniently had,—as in places where the Gospel is newly planted, and far removed from other churches already established,—there, that—amongst other considerations—the course of the Gospel should not be stayed till ordination be fetched from far countries, the Lord himself oftentimes supplieth the places of the ministers and elders, and layeth on His hands: such [is the] evidence of gifts and graces proper for the ministry as not only the church doth willingly acknowledge, but the enemies also—will they, nill they—are in their consciences convinced to be divine and excellent. And seeing it is evident, that neither the prophets under the Law nor many worthy ministers that God hath raised up since the time of Gospel, had ever, before their entrance into the ministry, their gifts solemnly approved, or been ordained; our Brethren must needs grant that this kind of ordination is not simply or absolutely necessary to the being of a minister. To which also this may be added, that our Saviour, in giving notice whereby the true pastor should be discerned from the false, nameth only these, That he enter himself, and lead the people in and out by that door: That the people of God agree with him, and consent to his ministry: That the Porter—the Holy Ghost—open the hearts of the hearers to him and his doctrine. Which three notes doubtless our Saviour would not have rested in, if there could have been no true minister without the ordination which our Brethren speak of, and urge that as a matter of absolute necessity. So that, to conclude this point, we say that the ordinary course of entering into the ministry is not kept, but a great imperfection and want is to be acknowledged where this election and ordination is not used; yet is not the want such as taketh away the very life and being of a true ministry!"

At page thirty-nine, these Puritans state it to be objected against their ministry, "That the administration and exercise of our function is not agreeable to the Word, but antichristian; because, say they, as at our entrance we 'swear canonical obedience to the Bishops,' so do we 'perform it, in our whole administration, by going to their courts; by standing and falling at their commandment!'" To this they answer, in part, that "As we may lawfully yield some obedience to the Bishops in these things, so we may lawfully bind ourselves by oath to do it, if our oaths be required of us by the christian magistrate's authority: especially seeing we do, by oath, bind ourselves to obey, in regard of the civil

authority which is committed to them by the christian magistrate. For our 'going to their courts;' this we answer: That seeing we do testify in our callings, our dislike to the vile and odious corruptions of their courts; and do also, utterly refuse to yield obedience to any of their unlawful decrees; we cannot, justly, be condemned for appearing in their courts or any other place whereunto we are, by his Majesty's authority, summoned. And, whereas the persons before whom we appear are judged, usually, corrupt, and enemies to that reformation which we desire; and some of them also such as—being no ministers themselves—do, by all means, seek the disgrace of our calling, and the utter discouragement of such Christians as in whom they perceive any sparks of true zeal; we account this our appearing at their courts, not only for an abridgment of our liberty, but also for such a burden as we have just cause to groan under, and to pray that God would, in his good time, move his Majesty's heart to ease us of it. And yet as the Apostle, being free, was content, for the Church's sake, not only to become bound in serving it with the labour of his hands, but also by subjecting himself to those ceremonies which, in Christ, were abolished; so may and ought we, for the Church's sake, to bear this burden rather than to forsake or refuse the ministry when the Lord hath called and fitted us unto it. For our yielding to the suspensions and deprivations; we answer, That so long as the Bishops suspend and deprive according to the law of the land, we account of the action herein as of the act of the Church, which we may and ought to reverence and yield unto: if they do otherwise, we have liberty given us, by the law, to appeal from them. If it be said, that the Church is not to be obeyed, when it suspends and deprives us for such causes as we, in our consciences, know to be insufficient: we answer, That it lieth in them to depose, that may ordain; and, they may shut, that may open!"

Another "objection" against their ministry, they say, in page forty-two, is "That we are not maintained according to the direction Christ hath given in his Testament; but our maintenance is Jewish and Antichristian! . . . And lest they should seem to say it only, they bring sundry reasons to prove that our maintenance is such as no minister of Christ can accept or live by: for, say ye, 'our ministers receive maintenance from all sorts of men in their parish, without difference.' This is alleged in their Collection of Letters, page eighteen; and called, in p. 145, of the Refutation, 'An execrable sacrilege, and covetous-making merchandize of the holy things of God; a letting out' of ourselves 'to hire, to the profane, for filthy lucre!' To this first reason they bring against our maintenance, this answer we give: 1. That the Christian magistrate is bound to use his authority for the furtherance of the subjects in all things that concern godliness and honesty; and to see that the moral law be kept by them: whereas, therefore, the Christian magistrate, in conscience of his duty, hath provided by the law, that all his subjects should, of the increase God giveth them, contribute somewhat towards the maintenance of their ministry; we may truly be said to receive our maintenance rather from the magistrate than from the people. 2. The magistrate may lawfully appoint so much of the subjects' goods, as by law is given to the minister's maintenance, to be employed

to this or any other good use; as is evident by that which the apostle saith, Rom. xiii. 7. 3. The magistrate may, without any show of wrong, compel the subjects to pay this part of their goods which they give to their minister; because in Parliament it was voluntarily bestowed, even by the people themselves, whose free act that is to be accounted which is enacted and done in Parliament. 4. It is evident by the Word, that the offerings which [the] heathen voluntarily brought, and gave to the building and beautifying of the Temple, were accepted of.^a 5. Seeing the apostle calleth it our 'own bread'^b we get by our honest labours;^c and our Saviour saith, in this case, that 'the labourer is worthy of his hire';^d we may, with comfort and good conscience, take maintenance of the wicked that live in our parishes, for whose sake, both publicly and privately we take pains, and to whom the benefit of our labour is offered; seeing that the apostle avoucheth that such as sow 'spiritual things' amongst the people—though God bless not their seed—may lawfully and honestly 'reap' their 'carnal things.'^e..

"Our maintenance," continue these Puritans, p. 44, "'is fixed and certain.' This is alleged in the sixty-first page of their 'Discovery,' and in sundry other parts of their writings. Concerning which, we answer, That this can be no good reason against all our ministers, seeing that we have some preach ordinarily and painfully, who yet either live wholly of themselves or take nothing of the people but that which they give voluntarily! If it be a great fault to live upon a set stipend, yet seemeth it strange unto us that they should account it so great [as] to make a nullity of our ministry. We can see no reason why it should be thought either unlawful or inconvenient to set stipends, to be given unto and received by the minister..! It standeth with sound reason that the minister's maintenance should be 'certain:' for first, seeing it is already proved that a sufficient maintenance must, necessarily, be given to the minister of [by] the people; how can it be unlawful either for the people by their own promise, or for the magistrate by law to bind them unto that which they should ordinarily do of themselves? Secondly; by this kind of maintenance, sundry of the people's infirmities,—as their grudging to give aught when it is in their power to give or not to give; their base estimation likewise of the minister, and looking for civil duties at his hand; and many such like,—are best prevented: yea, we deny that ever any church was so well informed wherein the most part of the people had not need to have such infirmities restrained in them by the wisdom and authority of the civil magistrate. . . Admit it might be proved from Matt. x., that no set maintenance were given to the ministers during the apostles' time, which cannot be; yet followeth not, that there should be none now; seeing that the church was then without those 'nourishing fathers,' which the Lord promised by the prophet,^f without whose authority we see not how that order for forced maintenance could be taken: neither doubt we to acknowledge even this for a special fruit of that blessing promised to come to the church by christian magistrates. Whereas they said 'That whatsoever is given to the maintenance of God's service, should be free and voluntary;' and allege, for

^a Ezra i. 4, 6; Neh. ii. 8.

^d Luke x. 7.

^b 2 Thess. iii. 12.

^e 1 Cor. ix. 11.

^c Ephes. iv. 28.

^f Isai xlix. 23.

that these places, Exod. xxv. 2; 2 Cor. viii. 12; ix. 5, 7; we answer, That the bond of the people's promise and magistrate's law, is no hinderance to the freedom and voluntariness; seeing the service and obedience of David was free and voluntary, notwithstanding the vow and oath he bound himself with, Psal. cxix. 106: so was that also which is mentioned in Nehemiah, x. 29; for if covenanting should take away the voluntariness of the act, then should it not be lawful to covenant with servants and labourers, or any other: yea the Lord our God doth bind himself by covenant, to give that reward to the faith and obedience of His servants which yet he giveth most freely and voluntarily!

"They allege against our maintenance," so they proceed in p. 46, "that we are 'maintained by Jewish tithes;' and concerning which, they have these words, in the sixtieth page of their 'Discovery,' 'It is evident, [they] who are thus maintained by those Jewish tithes and offerings, are not the ministers of Christ;' and a little after, 'These priests and people still retain the Levitical decimations, in the same forms, to the same ends:' and, p. 16, 'I could never see any difference between the Jews and them, save that the swine-herds, tithe-pigs and geese, etc.' To all which, we thus answer: first; it is evident that the tithes are not held, amongst us, by virtue of the Levitical law, but only by the positive law of our land:^a . . secondly; as the prince, without any show of Jewish superstition, may require, of the ministers, first-fruits and tenths; and of all the rest of the subjects, fifteenths and subsidies; for the maintenance of the wars, and other civil purposes; so doubt we not but he may as well,—especially by act of Parliament, which is also the act of the people,—require tenths of his people to the maintenance of the ministry; of which, as we have said before, he is bound to have a more special care and regard than of the maintenance of the wars or any other civil estate.

"Their *last* reason," page 47, "against our maintenance, is 'That it ariseth from Popish offerings, and mortuaries.' Concerning which, we answer as followeth: first; there be sundry of our ministers that receive none at all; against whose congregations and ministers, this reason cannot hold: and many even of them to whom the law alloweth 'offerings,' have refused them that were accustomed to be given at the churchings

^a Their "proof whereof," is so peculiar, considering against whom they contended, that we annex it in the shape of a note. "First, If this kind of maintenance were given to the minister for conscience and obedience to that law; why should not the first-fruits also, offerings, and divers other things which, by a plain commandment, were due to the Levitical priesthood, be given us as well as tithes? Secondly, The manner of tithing,—which in divers parts of our land, is diversly used, and which, through custom also, is many ways altered,—proveth that paying of tithes, amongst us, is not according to the Levitical law, nor in religious obedience thereunto. Thirdly, The law, by consent of the states in the Parliament, having alienated the tithes, in many places, from the minister unto the prince and other men; doth thereby, declare that it appointeth not the paying of the tithes by virtue of the law of God. Fourthly, Sundry of our ministers are,—and that even in the judgment of our whole Church,—lawfully by other means maintained than by tithes; which is also a plain demonstration that both the Levitical law is not held to be in force with us: and if it were, we might yet have some 'true' ministers in our land, notwithstanding."

[of women,] and burials, and such other, as the receiving whereof, they see, would be likely to nourish superstition in the people: secondly; if all did receive and live by 'offerings,' we see not what pollution can come to their 'ministry' thereby; for why may not that creature of God which was first given to profane and superstitious uses, be now lawfully translated to the maintenance of God's service? seeing that, even under the Law, translation was lawful when,—for a ceremony, to shadow what detestation the 'people of God' should bear to the manners of the heathen, and how they should be separated from them,—many things were made unclean to the Jews that are not so to us: . . . thirdly; if those 'offerings' were polluted things, yet are they too accidental to overthrow the very being and nature of our 'ministry.'"

"To the places of Scripture," these Puritans say, p. 56, "which they [the Separatists] bring against our 'people,' in the sixty-eighth page of their 'Collection of Letters and Conferences;' we answer, That they are all most unskilfully applied; for although some of them do prove that God's people should be separated from the rest of the world;^a . . . surely we cannot but wonder that our Brethren do thus deal with the sacred Word of God, they use to fill the margents of their books with such store of places of Scripture that the simple might think that they have even a cloud of witnesses against us, when themselves could not but know that the Scripture is, by them, dragged, as it were, by violence, to bear witness in a matter for which they have not one word to speak!"

The fourth part of the treatise of these anonymous Puritans, is headed "The Conclusion." Here they say, p. 57, "The first article in their"—the Separatists—"conclusion is this, 'The Assemblies which we go from, are such as the Word of God doth warrant us to go from.'" Nothing short of the very words could exhibit the infelicity, not to say, imbecility, of these opponents, in adding, "Whereunto we answer, that we may, much more strongly, conclude, upon that which we have above written, That because we have a true church, consisting of a lawful ministry, and a faithful people; therefore, they cannot separate themselves from us but they must needs incur the most shameful and odious reproach of manifest Schism!" In the next page, we find this other curious specimen of their intellectual and ecclesiastical prowess: "Even as a Christian may eat privately with a wicked man, or with an excommunicate person, in some cases, when his company cannot be eschewed; as being in an army, or prison, or ship upon the sea, amongst a company of vile, wicked men; being by the prince, or any other that hath power, enforced either to do so or utterly to want all food; so, much more, is it lawful for a Christian to eat with the wicked man at the Lord's table, wherein he is enforced either to do so or utterly to want all the great benefits and comforts that God offereth him in the Sacrament!" And as a further example of skill at straining a point, we copy these words from the same page: "Their," the Separatists', "testimonies,—2 Cor. vi. 14—18; Rev. xviii. 4,—do, indeed, partly concern that 'separation' which Christians should make from idolaters, in the service of God; yet do they no ways serve to justify this their Separation from us, unless

^a Lev. xx. 24; John xv. 16.

they would prove—which they are not able to do[!]^a—that those assemblies, which these Scriptures command a separation from, were in the profession of truth equal to us [!], or that the corruptions which are amongst us are equal unto such as were in those assemblies.” To the second article, or “reason” in the Separatists’ conclusion, “wherein they pretend a charitable regard of us who, by their joining with us in God’s worship, may be hardened in the liking of our corruptions; and, by their Separation, may, happily, be brought to repentance;” these “sundry, godly, and learned ministers,” answer, somewhat partially in regard to the premises, but in terms wherein the objects of their hostility could, nevertheless, join, “That the godly man who hath reproved the open offender, shunned his private familiarity, and hath gone so far in testifying his dislike to his sin as the bounds of his calling will permit, is no way accessory to his sin, nor hath any ‘fellowship’ with the ‘unfruitful works of darkness.’”^a And if that any wicked man will imagine that the godly do not much dislike him, because they will not, for his sake, shun the public worship of God; it is an offence taken and not given.” With the inference, however, we judge that no conscientious Separatist could have coincided: “And, therefore, such as wherewith the conscience of a godly man need not be troubled!”

The passage in immediate succession to that just dismissed, must, from what has preceded, be so unlooked for, as to serve to arouse the reader out of any moody temperament which this “Most Grave and Modest Confutation” might have brought him into. Mark, then, the testimony borne against their own side by the practical-*Inconformitants* who had audaciously laid the sin of *schism* upon “whosoever wittingly and willingly separateth himself” from “the Church of England,”^b which they so arduously laboured to evince was, in their time, “a true church of Christ.” In p. 60, thus it is written: “Thus have we answered that which they pretend for the warrant and necessity of their Separation from our Assemblies. And, now, lest any should be justly offended by thinking that, in this apology we make for our Church, we do any way plead for ‘Baal,’ or seek to daub up the breaches of our Church ‘with untempered mortar,’^c and so run ourselves into the danger of that curse which the Lord denounceth against them that call darkness, light, and speak good of evil; we therefore freely confess, That there are indeed, in our Church, great corruptions; and, that [it] is the great sin of our ministers, that they do not with so much zeal and courage reveal and show their dislike of them; and of our people, that they mourn not nor seek, by all humble and earnest means, to God and the magistrate, for Reformation of them, as they ought to do.” Still, after all this, and more, had it been convenient, in this stage of the dissensions, to avow so much, we find it stated a few lines lower, “Whereas they could not, with any just warrant to their consciences, separate themselves from us till they had found us obstinate in our corruptions, and contemptuous scornors of all good means used for reforming us; . . . we affirm that they have departed from us before they could . . . be so persuaded of us:” thus, they prescribed a rule in which the judgment and practice was to be all

^a Ephes. v. 11.^b P. 1.^c Ezek. xxii. 28.

on their own side ! And because these Puritans chose rather to hanker after the "flesh-pots" of Egypt,^a they, forsooth, must be "soundly convicted," and it must be "manifested" to their "judgment," what "dangerous errors" they hold, to justify Separation; although it is *manifested* that they who claimed to be, exclusively, The Church of England, were, as the Puritans themselves found, "obstinate" in their "corruptions," and "contemptuous scorers!" It is even matter of complaint, p. 62, that "those of them which once exercised the places of ministry amongst us, and received, for the same, the reward due, which they call 'Balaam's wages,'^b have not before or since their departure, made actual restitution of that which was—if their opinions be true—most unjustly received; nor yet showed themselves willing so to do, to their ability; which, notwithstanding, by the Law of God, they are most strictly bound to do."

It is asked, in page 66, "by what testimony of holy Scripture, can they warrant the admitting or choosing, into the ministry, such a one as, within some six or eight weeks before, was transplanted from so antichristian a Church and ministry, as they reckon ours to be; as not only Master Francis Johnson, but sundry other of their ministers have been?" And it is asked, further, in page 67, "What is there to be seen, amongst them, whereby so many simple Christians are deceived and moved to forsake us [!] and join to them: save only, that show of sincerity and zeal, and holy conversation, wherein they are thought to go far beyond any of us?"

Page 67, contains this passage, "This we dare boldly say, That there was never any man of note, in our Church, that, in his writings, hath bewrayed so irreligious and unsanctified a spirit as their chief leaders have done: for proof whereof, we desire the christian reader to consider, first, the shameful lies which, wittingly, and against the light of their own hearts, they have published, and whereby they have, in a manner, borne false witness against us. In the ninth page of their 'Discovery,' they say that 'All the atheists, papists, and anabaptists; and heretics of all sorts, whores, thieves, witches, conjurers, and who not? that dwell-eth in this Island, or is within the Queen's dominions, are received and nourished, within the bosom of this Church, with the Word and Sacraments; none are refused, none kept out.' Surely this were no libel, since it is the express doctrine of the Champion of their Church, that "There is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth, nor any member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England. . . . Nay, it is so with us, That no person appertaining to the one, can be denied also to be of the other!"^c

"What need we," to use their own words, p. 70, "any further evidence, or demonstration," of the "spirit" which actuated these Puritan Censors?

At this place we have the opportunity of noticing a piece of Johnson's, not before accessible to us: "A Treatise, Of the Ministry of the Church of England. Wherein is handled this Question, Whether it be to be separated from or joined

^a Exod. xvi. 3.

^b Deut. xxiii. 4.

^c Richard Hooker: Ecclesiastical Polity, Bk. viii. Sect. 1. Ed. 1830. vol. iii. p. 254.

unto : Which is discussed in two Letters ; the one written for it, the other against it. Whereunto is annexed, after the Preface, A brief Declaration of the ordinary Officers of the Church of Christ. And, a few Positions. Also, in the end of the Treatise, some Notes touching the Lord's Prayer : seven Questions ; a Table of some principal things contained in this Treatise.—1 Thess. v. 21 ; Jere. xxiii. 22 ; Isai. liii. 1 ; John xii. 38 ; Rom. x. 16." 4to. pp. 141. Dated, in p. 137,—1595.

That this is Johnson's production is acknowledged in the Preface to his piece intituled "An Answer to Master H. Jacob, his 'Defence of the Churches and Ministry of England.' 1600." 4to. pp. 217, of which, from p. 184, but paged on, is "An Answer to Master H. Jacob, his Treatise concerning the Priests of the Church of England, made by the Prelates, accepted and joined unto by the People: which he termeth 'a Pastoral Calling.' By Francis Johnson, an Exile for the Testimony of Jesus.—Jere l. 14 ; li. 26." Under Sect. 5, [p. xvi.] in the Preface to the former of these two, Johnson writes, "He knoweth that I have elsewhere written of this very point ;" and in the margin, he refers to the "Answer to Mr. H., p. 50." This corresponds ; and the "Mr. H." is in the margin, two pages back, thus, "Mr. Hild.," whom we take to be the Puritan divine, Arthur Hildersham, A. M., confirmed indeed by what we find in the Preface of the "Treatise," where it says, "The ground and occasion of these Letters . . . was this, There was a gentlewoman imprisoned because she would not join with the public ministry of England in the worship of God. She being much solicited to the contrary, gave in writing a *reason* of that her faith and practice to one Mr. A. H., a minister, and a man very learned. The *reason* was this, . . . 'Whosoever he be that dealeth with the holy things of God, and worketh upon the consciences of men, by virtue of an antichristian power, office, and calling, him the people of God ought not to receive and join themselves unto : But all the ministers that stand over the church assemblies in England, deal [and work so] : . . . Therefore the people of God ought not to receive them, or join themselves unto them. 2 Thess. ii. 4—10.' Unto this argument, Mr. H. made answer by a Letter unto her. . . To get it answered, was obtained of one Mr. F. Jo., prisoner for the same cause, who also directed his answer to the fore-said gentlewoman. Both of these, with some few other things, are now set forth for thy benefit, good Reader."

Having taken—see vol. i. p. 104—seventeen heads of "False Doctrine" from Johnson's "Answer" to Jacob ; we select from this "Treatise," p. 93—95, 98, 105, a number of like kind concerning the "Priesthood" of the Church of England. He introduces it by requiring of Hildersham, "That he would a little pause, and take a view of that themselves have published touching their priests heretofore, for whom he now pleadeth. As, for example, to give him a taste : they write, that 'Their parsons, vicars, parish priests, stipendiaries, with the rest, came from the Pope, as out of the Trojan horse's belly, to the destruction of God's kingdom.' Also, that 'The Church of God never knew them : Admonition to the Parliament ; first and second. . . Now, to proceed ; it followeth in his writing [Letter], thus, 'Tell us not that the same name is given to our office as to the popish sacrificers. Do you think the worse of yourself because you are called Brownists ? And shall the holy office and calling which is so agreeable to the Word, be disliked because it is called a Priesthood ? Considering, that though it agree in name, yet it differeth in nature and substance as much from the popish priesthood as light doth from darkness.' . . . Let men call us 'Brownists' or what they please, it troubleth not us, seeing we are so termed untruly and unjustly. But for their name of 'Priests' it is far otherwise. . . Which, although it be sufficiently proved already, . . . it shall be good here, by way of comparison, to set down the agreement of theirs with the Popish Priesthood, on the one hand ; and, on the other, the disagreement of them both from the Pastor's office which Christ hath appointed.

1. "And first of all, it would be known, what the cause is why they retain the same 'name' if they have not the same 'office :'. . . as also, if they have the same 'office' with the Pastors described in the Word, why then they have not also the same 'name ?'. . . Are these men wiser than the Apostles ? . . . are they fathers in Christ, more than the Apostles ? Eph. iv. 11, with 1 Cor. iv. 15. . . But we will proceed to compare them together, in other things which themselves account of greater moment, as in these which follow.

2. "The office of the popish priesthood is such as before any receive it, they must first be made deacons by some prelate : such also, is the office of priesthood

received and used in England: but such is not the pastor's office appointed by Christ; Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Acts xiv. 23; Tit. i. 5—9; Rom. xii. 4—8.

3. "The popish priests are capable of the offices of archbishops, lord-bishops, archdeacons, suffragans, deans, etc., retaining still their office of priesthood withal: so are the priests of England: but so are not pastors whom Christ hath given to His church; 2 Cor. vi. 15—17; Rev. xiv. 9—12; Gal. ii. 18; Rom. xii. 7; Eph. iv. 11, 12; 1 Cor. xii. 5, 18, 28.

4. "The popish priests may in their constitution, notwithstanding their ecclesiastical office, take upon them civil offices and callings—as to be justices of peace, county-palatine, lord-president, lord-chancellor, etc.—and be honoured likewise with the titles of kings and nobles; as grace, lord, honour, metropolitan, primate, etc.: so is it also with the priests of England in their constitution: but so is it not with the pastors ordained by Christ in His church; Luke xii. 14; xxii. 25, 26; 1 Pet. v. 3; John v. 44; Rom. xii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 4.

5. "The popish priests in their constitution are inferior officers to archbishops, lord-bishops, archdeacons, etc.: so are also the priests of England: but so are not pastors in the constitution and churches of Christ; Eph. iv. 11, 12; Rom. xii. 7, 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28; 1 Tim. v. 17; Acts xiv. 23; xx. 17, 28.

6. "The popish priests must be ordained to their office by a lord-bishop or his suffragan: so must also the priests of England: but so may not the pastors of the churches of Christ; but either by the eldership or,—at the churches' first growing into order, when yet they have not elders,—by some of the fittest members, in the church's name; and by the church's authority appointed thereunto; 1 Tim. iv. 14; Num. viii. 10.

7. "The popish priests at their ordination must be presented to the lord-bishop by an archdeacon or his deputy:.. so likewise must the priests of England be presented: but so may not the pastors, appointed by Christ; Rev. xiv. 9, 11, 12; 2 Cor. vi. 14—17.

8. "The popish priests must be ordained to their office according to their pontifical, devised by themselves: in like manner must the priests of England be ordained to their office, according to their pontifical; that is, according to their Book of Ordering Priests and Deacons:.. but so may not any be ordained to the pastor's office, but only according to the Testament of Christ; John x. 1, 2, 7; Acts xiv. 23; 1 Tim. iii. 10, 15; iv. 14; Heb. v. 4; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

9. "The popish priests at their ordination must kneel upon their knees at the feet of the lord-bishop that ordaineth them; and he must say unto them—though blasphemously—'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc.:' so must the priests of England likewise be ordained, humbly kneeling at the prelate's feet, and with the same blasphemous words spoken unto them by the prelate: but so may not the pastors of Christ be ordained; Rev. xiv. 9—11; 1 Cor. xii. 4—7, etc.; John xx. 22, 23; Isai. xlii. 8, with 2 Thess. ii. 2—4.

10. "The popish priests are not ordained in and before the congregation where they are to have charge and minister, but in metropolitan or cathedral cities, or at some of the prelate's palaces, or where else he pleaseth to give 'orders,' as they call it; sometimes forty, or fifty, or sixty miles from the place where they are to minister; so are the priests of England: but not the pastors of the churches of Christ; for they are and must be ordained in the face and presence of the congregation whereof they are chosen pastors; Acts xiv. 23; vi. 2, 3, 5, 6; i. 15; Num. viii. 9, 10.

11. "The popish priests are taken and ordained without fasting and prayer of the congregation where they are to minister: so are the priests of England: but pastors not so; Acts xiv. 23; xiii. 3.

12. "The popish priests taking charge of souls, are not elected by the congregation whereof they are to take charge, but are presented by a patron to the lord-bishop, to be instituted and inducted into a benefice, being deacons or priests before, so made by the prelates: thus also are the priests of England: whereas, contrariwise, the pastors of Christ are elected by free and voluntary choice of the church whereof they are to be overseers; Acts xiv. 23; vi. 2, 3, 5; 2 Cor. viii. 19; Num. viii. 9; Ezek. xxxiii. 2.

13. "The refusal of the whole parish cannot debar a popish priest from having charge of their souls when he is presented by the patron, and instituted by the

prelate: neither can it the priests in the parishes of England: but so it is not with the pastors and churches of Christ; Acts xiv. 23; vi. 2, 3, 5; 2 Cor. viii. 19.

14. "The popish priests may at their pleasure, without consent of the people, resign or give over their benefices and, commonly, betake themselves to some other of greater value: so may also the priests of England: but pastors may not give over or leave the flock over which the Holy Ghost, by the churches' calling, hath made them overseers, except it be with consent of the church, and for such cause as is warranted by the said Holy Ghost in the written Word; Acts xx. 28, with xiv. 23; Col. iv. 17; Rom. xii. 7; 1 Pet. v. 1—4; Isai. lxii. 6, 7; Ezek. iii. 26, 27, with xxxiii. 22; Num. viii. 25.

15. "One popish priest in their constitution may and doth take the charge and commodity of many parishes and benefices at once: so also may the priests of England: whereas pastors have but one only flock depending upon them, whereunto they must attend with all faithful diligence; 1 Pet. v. 2, 3; Acts xiv. 23; xx. 28; Rom. xii. 3—7; Tit. i. 5; 1 Thess. v. 12—14; Heb. xiii. 17; Ezek. xxxiv. 1—31.

16. "The popish priests wait not the churches' calling to the ministry, but seek and make suit to some prelate to be ordained priests, giving money also for their Letters of Orders: so do also the priests of England: but so do not pastors, but stay till the Lord by His church call them to that office; Heb. v. 4; Acts xx. 28; with xiv. 23; Isai. lxii. 6, 7; Ezek. xxxiii. 2, with Jer. xxiii. 21, and 2 Chron. xiii. 9.

17. "The popish priests are ordained to their office though they have no flock to attend upon; yea, commonly, twenty or thirty of them are ordained at once, whereof no one is called to any particular congregation; but they must afterward, like masterless men, seek and sue for places where to be employed: so is it also with the priests of England: whereas pastors are always ordained to the attendance of a certain particular church for the work of the ministry therein; Acts xiv. 23; xx. 28; Tit. i. 5; 1 Pet. v. 2; Rev. i. 20.

18. "Such be popish priests and have cure of souls among them as are not at all able to preach the Word: such be also priests and have charge of souls in England: but none such be pastors but they only that, being 'apt to teach,' are lawfully called to that office; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12; Tit. i. 7, 9; John x. 1—5; Num. xvi. 5, 40.

19. "Of the popish priests that can preach it is required that, besides ordination to their office, they have special licence from the prelates to preach: so is it also required of the priests of England: but not of the pastors of Christ; Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. vii. 23; ix. 16; xii. 5, 28; Eph. iv. 12; Rev. xiv. 9—12.

20. "The popish priests are subject to be silenced, suspended, deprived, degraded, by the prelates: so are also the priests of England: but not pastors; Rev. ii. 1; xiv. 9, 12; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2; Isai. lxii. 1, 6, 7; Zech. xi. 17; Jer. xlviii. 10; 1 Cor. ix. 16; xii. 28; Acts iv. 19, 20; xx. 28.

21. "The popish priests at their institution must swear to perform canonical obedience to the prelates their ordinaries: so must the priests of England: but not pastors; 1 Cor. xii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 2—4; Rev. ii. 1; xiv. 9, 12; Acts v. 29, 31; John xv. 14; Rom. vi. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 14—16.

22. "The popish priests are tied to a book of stinted prayers, and a prescript order devised by man, for their worship and ministration: so likewise are the priests of England bound to a prescript order of service and book of common-prayer, taken out of the pope's portuis: whereas the pastors of the churches of Christ are free to use their gifts received from Christ for the work of His ministry, being tied therein to no inventions of men, but only to the rule and order which Christ, in his Word, hath appointed thereunto; Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12; 1 Cor. xii. 4—8, 11; Exod. xxx. 9, with Psal. cxli. 2, and Rev. viii. 3; Isai. xxix. 13; Matt. xv. 9; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11; 2 Tim. i. 6, 7; Rom. viii. 26; John iv. 24; 1 Tim. iii. 15; vi. 13, 14, with Gal. iii. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

23. "The popish priests are bound in that office to perform such actions as Christ never appointed for the work of his ministry; as to church women, to bury the dead, to solemnize marriage, etc.: so are the priests of England: but so are not pastors; Eph. iv. 11, 12; Rom. xi. 7, 8; 1 Tim. iii. 15; v. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

24. "The popish priests be not of like and equal power, degree, and authority, among themselves; but are, some of them, inferior to other herein, as parsons to

archdeacons, archdeacons to lord-bishops, lord-bishops to archbishops : so is it with the priests of England : but not with pastors, for they have, all of them, like and equal power, degree, and authority, under Christ the only Archbishop and great Shepherd of the sheep ; 1 Pet. v. 3, 4 ; ii. 25 ; Luke xxii. 24—26 ; Rev. i. 20 ; Eph. iv. 11, 12 ; Acts xx. 28 ; Heb. xiii. 17, 20.

25. “ The popish priests, together with their people, stand subject to the ecclesiastical courts, canons, citations, excommunications, absolutions, and other the like jurisdiction of the prelates and their officials : so stand also the priests of England and their people : but so stand not the pastors and churches of Christ ; Rev. xiv. 4, 9, 12 ; Matt. vi. 24 ; xxviii. 20 ; John iii. 35, 36 ; x. 4, 5 ; Gen. xlix. 10 ; Isai. xxxiii. 22 ; Jas. iv. 12 ; Heb. iii. 1—3.

26. “ The popish priests have, joined with them, in their charge, churchwardens and sidemen, which are sworn to present to the ordinary’s court, as also to his chancellors’ and commissaries’ courts, all such offences, faults, and defaults, as be committed among them against the prelates’ articles and injunctions : so is it also with the priests of England : but not with the pastors of the churches of Christ, wherein they are not only freed from all antichristian bondage, but have also joined with them teachers and elders for the instruction, oversight, and guidance of the church, according to the ordinances of Jesus Christ, and no other ; 1 Tim. v. 17 ; vi. 13, 14 ; Rom. xii. 7, 8 ; Eph. iv. 11, 12 ; 1 Cor. xii. 5, 28 ; xiv. 37 ; Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23 ; xx. 17, 28 ; 1 Pet. v. 1—3 ; Matt. xxviii. 20.

27. “ The popish priests, with their churchwardens and people, have not the power of Christ to cast out any from among them ; neither have in this, nor anything else in their constitution, the keys of the kingdom of heaven to open and shut, to bind and loose, to remit and retain, according to the Word and ordinance of Jesus Christ ; but the chief ecclesiastical power and authority among them is in the hands of the prelates, and their chancellors, archdeacons, and officials, to be administered according to their canons and constitutions, as before is said : so is it also with the priests, churchwardens, and people of England : but contrarily with the pastors, elders, and people of the churches of Christ ; Matt. xvi. 16, 19, with xviii. 17, 18 ; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5 ; 2 Cor. ii. 6—8 ; x. 4—6 ; Psal. cxlix. 9 ; Num. v. 2, 3 ; 1 Thess. v. 12, 14 ; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14, 15 ; Eph. iv. 11, 12 ; 1 Tim. v. 17 ; Acts xx. 28 ; Rom. xvi. 17 ; Rev. xix. 14, 15 ; 2 Cor. vi. 14—16.

28. “ The popish priests must be discerned from the other people by surplice, tippet, square cap, etc. : so must also the priests of England : but not pastors ; Isai. xxx. 22 ; lii. 11 ; 2 Cor. vi. 17 ; Rev. xviii. 4 ; 1 Tim. iii. 2 ; iv. 12, 16 ; Num. xv. 39.

29. “ The popish priests, by virtue of their ordination to that office, are capable of induction and institution to any benefice whereto they are presented, to receive the tithes, glebes, chrisms, oblations, and such like maintenance belonging thereunto : so are also the priests of England : but so are not any by virtue of ordination to the pastor’s office ; neither is the pastor’s maintenance to be by tithes or any other Jewish or popish manner, but only of the Gospel, as Christ hath ordained ; 1 Cor. ix. 14 ; Gal. vi. 6 ; Rom. xv. 27 ; 1 Thess. v. 12, 13, with Heb. vii. 5, 12 ; Col. ii. 17.

30. “ The popish priesthood was never appointed by Christ, but is a new ministry devised by man, even the man of sin, in the office, entrance, administration and maintenance thereof ; 2 Thess. iii. 4, 8 ; Rev. ix. 3 ; xiii. 16, 17 ; xiv. 8—11 ; xvii. 1—5 ; xviii. 11 : such is also the priesthood of England : whereas the pastor’s office, Eph. iv. 11 ; Rom. xii. 8 ; entrance, Acts xiv. 23 ; vi. 2, 3, 5 ; Num. viii. 9, 10 ; Heb. v. 4 ; 1 Tim. iii. ; iv. 14 ; Col. iv. 17 ; administration, 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17 ; Eph. iv. 8, 12 ; Rom. xii. 8 ; 1 Tim. iii. 15 ; v. 17, 21 ; vi. 3, 13, 14 ; Tit. i. 7, 9 ; Acts xv. 6, 22 ; xx. 28 ; 1 Thess. v. 12—14 ; 1 Pet. v. 2, 3 ; 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2 ; Gal. i. 8, 9 ; and maintenance, is not any invention of man, but the appointment of Christ set down in his Word ; 1 Cor. ix. 14 ; Gal. vi. 6 ; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18 ; 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.

31. “ The popish priesthood is such in their office, entrance, administration, and maintenance, as princes and magistrates may and ought, by their authority, to abolish it out of their dominions ; Rev. xvii. 16 ; 1 Kings xxiii. 5, etc. ; Deut. xii. 2—4 ; 1 Tim. ii. 2 ; Psal. lxxii. 1, etc., Rom. xiii. 4 : such is also the priesthood of England, in all those particulars : but such is not the pastor’s place and function ; Eph. iv. 11—13 ; 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 28 ; Rom. xii. 8 ; xiii. 3 ; Heb. xii. 28 ; 1 Tim. ii. 2 ; v. 17 ; vi. 13—15.

32. "The popish priesthood is such in all the particulars aforesaid, as the Lord Jesus will consume with the brightness of His appearing in the light and power of his Gospel, before his second coming; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Rev. xiv. 6—8; xvii. 1; xviii. 20—23; with Jer. li. 60—64; Rev. xix. : such is also the priesthood of England : whereas, on the contrary, the pastor's office and function is to continue to the end of the world, even till we all meet together in the unity of faith, and acknowledgment of the Son of God, to a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; Eph. iv. 11—13; Rom. xii. 5, 8; Heb. xii. 28; v. 20; 1 Tim. iii; Matt. xxviii. 17; vi. 13, 14.

33. "Finally, therefore, the popish priesthood is such as none may have any spiritual communion therewith, but all ought to forsake and depart from it, though all princes under heaven should command the contrary; John x. 5; Rev. ix. 3; xiv. 9—11; xviii. 4; Amos iv. 4, 5; v. 5; Num. xvi. 24, 26; Matt. vii. 15; Psal. cxix. 113, 128; 2 Cor. vi. 14—17 : such is also the priesthood of England : whereas, on the other side, the pastor's function is such as is not to be left but to be joined unto in the service of God, notwithstanding the prohibition of princes or any other whomsoever to the contrary; Eph. iv. 11, 12; 1 Tim. v. 17; vi. 13—15; Rom. xii. 4—8; 1 Cor. xii. 5, 28; xiv. 37; Matt. xxviii. 20."

CHAP. LI.

RATHBAND AND HIS OPPONENT, WELDE.

AGREEABLY to our resolution, at the commencement of this our undertaking, that we would work our way steadily through "evil report and good report;"^a and that it shall never be said truly of us, *Ne aspectum quidem hostis sustinere valuerunt*; *here*, though having but just rid ourselves of one species of encounter, we enter upon another, with unshaken purpose. It is embodied in "A Brief Narration of some Church-courses held, in Opinion and Practice, in the Churches lately erected in New England : Collected out of sundry of their own Printed Papers and Manuscripts, with other good Intelligences. Together with some short Hints, given by the way, of their Correspondence with the like Tenets and Practices of the Separatists' Churches : And some short Animadversions upon some Principal Passages, for the Benefit of the vulgar Reader.—Presented to Public View, for the Good of the Church of God ; by W. R. 1644." 4to. pp. 55.

That this editor or publisher, is W. Rathband, the same as the foregoing,^b there can be no doubt; from the initials, from the bookseller's name, and from an allusion, in the Postscript, page 53, to the "Grave Confutation." If it be the same, there is, however, an effort to conceal it, for some cause which is not explained. His Preface opens thus :—"Christian Reader ; Give me leave, before I present thee with the Narration following, to apologize something for myself. I have not fallen upon this task for want of other work, nor out of any itching, much less ambitious desire to appear in print, which, as I never affected, so much less now, when it is become no singular praise ; for, *scribimus omnes, indocti, doctique* : nor out of any malignancy of spirit against the men

^a 2 Cor. vi. 8.

^b See back, p. 272.

whose church-ways I here relate, whom, so far as I know them, I profess—God and my conscience bearing me witness^a—highly to love and honour in the Lord. But the first occasion of my thoughts, in this kind, was that a solemn agreement being, a good-while since, made between the Brethren of the Independent way, then, and still, residing in London, and those of the opposite judgment; wherein, amongst other things on both sides agreed upon, those Brethren promised then shortly to put forth a Narrative of their doctrine and practice in church-courses, that so it might appear where the differences lay. Which Narrative being once published,—the materials whereof they then professed to be all ready,—they also promised to join with the rest, in preaching against the Brownists, Anabaptists, and other sectaries. But the said Brethren—though sundry times called upon to put forth their Narrative, according to promise,^b—have yet not only delayed, but at length altogether denied to do the same. Upon which denial, I began to entertain some thoughts of making a Narrative myself: and began so to do, but through many discouragements I laid it by again; till, of late, some of the said Brethren, that had formerly promised the Narrative, published a ‘Narration Apologetical,’ which seemed, in title, to me, a performance of the former engagement; but when I had read it, I found it nothing less [than Apologetical,] as being neither full nor clear, as a Narration ought to be: but touching that, I will say no more, because others better able have [dealt,] and I hope will, deal thoroughly with it.

“Only I let the Reader know, that upon this occasion I resumed my former purpose; considering, now, the necessity of such a course, in regard, That not only themselves continued in that way, but also others, both ministers and people, out of ignorance or inconsideration were daily drawn aside thereto: new churches were erected according to their model; our churches and ministry, and God’s ordinances in them, began to be neglected, slighted, deserted, yea contumeliously and scornfully reproached as ‘Antichristian, Babylonish, false, and null,’^c that many were distracted and doubtful what to hold and do, and to which side to cleave: some thought better of their ways, and others worse, than they deserved; and both sorts, for want of right information what they were! That, the full relation of their ways, if it did not turn men quite off from them, yet, at least might so far prevail as to make men pause awhile and inquire further into them before they were too far engaged; espe-

^a “It would grieve a tender heart to hear this man call ‘God, &c.’ and by and by to assault with horrible untruths and bitter invectives.”—Welde’s Answer, p. 1.—See it hereafter.

^b “Some of us profess, solemnly, we never so much as heard of any ‘promise.’ . . If they did not this so soon as he would have them, let him know, the extreme distractions of these times, and the public service of some of these Brethren who were employed by the State, for a good space together, might justly hinder greater things than this.” *Ibid.* p. 1, 2.

^c “Such contemptuous speeches and reproachful carriages cast upon the Brethren of the churches here, neither are nor ever were allowed by us. . . They are not alone in these reproaches; ourselves also are fellow-sufferers with them herein, from divers Sectaries now in London, whose usual tones and dialects these words he mentions, are, and not the voice of Independents.” *Ibid.* p. 2.

cially, might give occasion of a more full agitation of all these differences in this venerable Assembly of Divines now met for consultation about matters of this nature. That, all the printed books which I had seen, did not, together, make out a full story; and that what was in them here and there dispersed, could not be so satisfactory as to see all things together, in a short synopsis, with one view. That, myself, by Divine providence, had sundry intelligences lying by me, which, joined to what was already printed, might either make the story complete, or else might occasion and spur on some other—perhaps of themselves—to publish a better. And, lastly, That some of that way, contrary to their former promises and pactions, and laying by not only the due regard we think they should have had, of their Brethren of the contrary judgment, but also the public peace and common cause of Reformation—which, by such distractions is retarded—have, impetuously, both in pulpit and press, besides what they have done in private, laboured to promote these their popular church-ways as the only ways of God; and to make all men they could, to disrelish and abominate that which—for distinction's sake—we call 'Presbyterian' Government.^a These and other like things, after much pondering in my spirit, at last cast the balance, and caused me to resolve to pursue my first intention in this way as here you see.

"Now, lest I be mistaken, I desire the Reader to understand . . . that I intend not . . . to set down all things, . . . but such things only, or for the most part, wherein there lies some difference between them and us, or other the best Reformed churches. Neither do I intend to wrap up all and every one of the Elders—much less, members—of the New England churches in the same imputations: forasmuch as . . . some of them do not only differ from the rest, but have stiffly opposed the rest therein; which I write to preserve the just repute of some eminent persons there from such censures and hard opinions as others of them, perhaps, may seem to merit and incur."^b

^a "To show how far from this spirit and practice we have been, consider how loth we were to appear in the case, who, though we had books of this subject ready for the press, yet, by joint consent, suppressed them; haply to the great detriment of our cause, for that we were unwilling to blow a fire. When we did appear in pulpit or press, whether it was without instigation or not, and how sparing we have been ever since—until some late forced replies—and how inoffensive in our carriages and preachings, we leave to all godly to judge. Instance but in the Holland Brethren's 'Apology;' was it 'impetuously done?' Was it a mock 'Narrative,' a mere gull? as this man most abusively styles it. Was it not rather 'full of peaceableness, modesty, and candour; and seasonably needful,' as that Reverend man affirmed in print? Doth not W. R. know that about this time of 'promises and pactions,' or a while after, our Brethren of the Presbyterian way did write a Letter into Scotland with many of their hands to it, telling the ministers there, they did approve of their Government, and would join in the furtherance of it? Now, for him to bind our hands, and seal up our mouths, and then, underhand, at the same time to fore-determine the matter, and be engaged in that way, before any solemn dispute, and yet to accuse us for breaking 'pactions,' seems neither rational nor fair." *Ibid.* p. 2.

^b "I crave leave . . . to give some few directions. . . . At the end of the several articles [in each chapter], are set down the proofs thereof, collected out of their printed papers and . . . manuscripts. . . . After the said proofs, . . . follow, by themselves, . . . quotations [references] of some one or more writers of the 'Brownists,' which,

Such is the plan on which the "Brief Narration" of W. R. is printed; and such, also, is the unusual manner in which the "Answer" to it is printed; that, to render both the more perspicuous, we shall resort to placing as notes the several portions of the latter which we deem useful. But we must previously prepare the reader by setting before him the necessary preliminary information.

We begin with "An Answer to W. R., his 'Narration of the Opinions and Practices of the Churches lately erected in New England: Vindicating those Godly and Orthodox Churches from more than a Hundred Imputations, fathered on them and their Church-way by the said W. R. in his Book. Wherein is plainly proved: 1. That the Grounds of his 'Narration' are sandy and insufficient. 2. That the Manner of his handling it [is] unloving, and irregular. 3. That the Matter of it [is] full of gross Mistakes and divers Contradictions. 4. That the Quotations [are] extremely wrested, and out of measure abused. 5. That his Marginal Notes [are] Impertinent and Injurious.—By Thomas Welde, Pastor of the Church of Roxborough, in New England.—Jude, 10 [first clause]; Prov. xviii. 17.—This is Licensed and Entered according to Order. Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 68.

This Author's "Epistle to the Reader" begins, "There was a law in Israel, that if any man did bring 'an ill name upon a Virgin of Israel,' the matter was to come before the Elders, and he was to be chastised, and amerced 'a hundred shekels of silver.'^a There is one W. R., if thou knowest the man, that hath brought many ill reports, not upon one virgin, but all the virgin churches of New England. When thou seest him, do so much as bring him forth to answer this law. Tell him, we purpose to try an action with him, and have satisfaction from him: and if he saith he hath not raised these reports himself, but had them from others; then tell him again, from us, 'That cannot satisfy; for we have learned from Divine and human laws, that if any be taken reporting of slanders,—as we shall abundantly show he hath done in his Narrative,—he may be charged as the raiser of them, until he can clear himself, by bringing such authors into light as will own them. . . To produce Barrowe, Browne, Robinson, etc. for authors,—for they were dead before New England churches were born,—or H. W., T. P., and I know not what private Letters, lying by him in his study,—for we know not their voice,—[is not relevant]: nor let him say, 'it was told me,' as

being consulted with, it will appear that the opinions, &c. in the preceding articles, do very much agree with them: . . underneath the same, . . short animadversions, . . to admonish the vulgar and injudicious Reader, lest by reading things so plausibly put forth as some of them are, he should be ensnared at unawares. . . 'Ans. to 32 Q.' and 'Ans. to 9 Pos.,' and 'Discourse of Cov. ;' look for these in the book lately published by Mr. H. Peters. 'Cott. Cat.,' I call . . Mr. Cotton's Church Constitution, by way of Question and Answer: there are also cited two printed letters, under the same name. . . 'Apol.,' that is 'The Apology of the Churches in New England, for the Church Covenant,' which I have by me, in MS. Most of the other quotations [references], are of letters between friend and friend. When you have 'Rob. Apol.,' that belongs to the allegation of the 'Brownists,' and is distinct from the former, [from New England]. The rest are more easy. Now the blessing of Heaven go with this poor pamphlet." Pref. *fn.*

^a Deut. xxii. 18, 19.

he often doth, for we protest against such testimony; nor, 'I was informed so,' etc. . . for fama est mendax, and prejudice hardly speaks well of any. . . Wonder not, this Answer stayed so long: . . I thought it should need no other answer than itself, until I perceived some ill effects of it. But why do I undertake this work? I am one of the *nearest kinsmen* to those churches, of any other man in these parts: . . few or none are here, [who] have had more experience of New England 'church-courses' than myself; . . and to whom I am returning, when God makes way. . . God knows my spirit, how exceeding loth I was to controvert with a Brother,—though but a defendant,—and to uncover his nakedness; but when God calls, I am bound with Moses, when he saw the Hebrew did wrong to his brother, to say, 'Why smitest thou thy fellow?' . .^a I think it not meet to answer all I could: . . neither is it possible for me to answer the sayings of his private Letters lying by him,—such a ground of church-stories as I never heard of!—because I know neither who they are, nor what their own words are; or if I did, were it material. . . Nor is it my scope, to discuss the points of Discipline,—that work is in abler hands,—but I look upon his book as a historical narration, and accordingly I frame my answer. Though he brings not the words of any of his authors cited, . . yet I have done it for him; especially in the last six or eight chapters, that you may judge whether he hath dealt fairly with them or not. . . When, at any time, in my answer, I say such an article, or such a clause, is 'untrue' or is 'false,' I am not willing to impute the falsity thereof to the author's knowledge; I would judge otherwise of him than so; but to the thing itself asserted. . . Thine, T. W."

By way of proem, or introduction, Welde writes, "As he [W. R.] saith he had 'laid by' the thoughts of it ['of making a Narrative myself'] a good while, through many discouragements; so, I conceive, if he had cast them by for ever, and made the place of conception their grave, he had dealt better for the truth and himself. But he is very angry for want of 'Narratives:' one, he must have; and one he will have, be it right or wrong; and if neither New England nor Holland Brethren be worth a 'Narrative,' let him come, he will frame one himself; and this shall be no mock 'Narrative,' no mere gull, as the Holland-Brethren produced; but a more solid thing! Now, what it is, will appear, if we weigh three things: i. That the Grounds on which he builds it, are sandy and insufficient. ii. The Manner of his proceeding [is] unloving, and irregular. iii. The Matter of it, 1, full of gross mistakes, contrarieties to the truth, and contradictions to itself; 2, his 'quotations' abused extremely, and wrested; 3, his marginal notes, very scandalous and offensive. . .^b

"You would think that the Grounds on which all his work is founded, and all New England churches [are] taxed, had need be sound, even adequate; or else he will not prove himself a wise builder: but they are these three; our own 'printed' books; private letters; 'other good intelligences,' as himself saith, in his title.

"For the printed Books which he quotes, they are writings of some godly and learned men there; but that these be rightly conceived [of]

^a Exod. ii. 13.

^b P. 3.

know, these books, five in number, are not written from all the 'Elders:' two of them, but from one only; another, from some few; none of them, from all: not written to the churches here, as a platform of our practice, but sent as an 'Answer' to some one or more Brethren in England, that desired satisfaction to some Queries of their own; whereof W. R. himself was one:^a nor intended by them for the Press, much less to be made a standard, to prove our churches' opinions and ways by; but published by some well-minded here, without their knowledge, yea, against the minds of some of them. Yet, if he had kept close to these in his 'Narration,' he had saved his credit and my pains: but you shall see he hath so abused and wrested them—I dare say, in wellnear a hundred places—that his assertions are not their sayings and words, but his own; and they will leave him to quit himself as well as he can; for as Scripture itself... abused, is no Scripture, so the writings of men perverted, are no more theirs: this we shall make plentifully appear.

"Sundry private 'Letters' lying by him, as he saith, sent from 'New England,'—but names only two letters of their names—are another Ground of his story: and whatsoever any one of these writs,—though never so privately [sent], and unknown to any other man in any of all the churches,—must needs be the opinion of all the churches in New England! But to show the invalidity, yea, and impossibility of this, to be a good ground, consider, These are incompetent proofs, and liable to great and just exceptions; for some there, are contrary to us, in their opinions—antinomians, familists, antichurchians, etc.—and even some of his cited Letters, as near as we can gather, are from some of these! others that write Letters from thence, are weak in judgment, not understanding what the churches hold, or not able to express aright what they themselves understand: are all these fit to be the churches' interpreters? Doth not W. R. himself, in his preface, say, 'scribimus omnes, indocti, doctique?' Others may be novices, and not well verst in our way, nor ripe to give the churches' verdict: some others, haply, are but in part of our judgment, and not come off fully to the churches' practices there: others are prejudiced against the place and persons, and, prejudice, himself knows, can hardly speak well. And, we know, divers such have written Letters which, it is likely, are fallen into his hands; therefore, these cannot be built upon for competent witnesses! And whereas he saith, in his 'Postscript,' p. 50, that these Letters come from 'members' of churches, and many from 'ministers of the Word:' it is answered, That 'members' of churches, and 'ministers' too, may be liable to some or other,—and some of them, possibly, to many—of the said exceptions: neither is it in our power, nor in any church in the world, to cure all their 'members,' or 'ministers' either, of their distempers; for if it were, you would not suffer your own churches... to be so infected with sundry gross errors as they are.^b

"I have good ground to question; because he thrusts in, T. G. to J. G. amongst his New England Letters; and yet these men never came there, though himself saith in 'Postscript,' p. 50, that his Letters 'come' from 'members' of our churches in New England; and as he

^a See back, p. 22, note b.

^b P. 4, 5.

adds some, so he may add more, for aught I know. . . He tells us other stories, in this book, that are as far from truth as Old England is from New. . . If he hath so extremely mistaken the 'printed' Letters, which he knows we can come at to peruse, how can we, or any else, be assured that he hath not more abused his private Letters, which no eye, but his own, may see? . . . If this be a good ground, to prove churches' judgments, by private Letters; mark what absurdities will ensue: 1. That we must believe that the churches of New England deny a power of votes, ordinarily, to the people; because Mr. Parker, a pastor there, wrote so;^a and so, of necessity, we must believe a falsehood: 2. That if W. R., and two or three more, should write unto New England of *their* allowance of the lawfulness of an imposed Common Prayer-Book; then, we may write, and print it,—for so doth W. R.,—that the churches and ministers in Old England do, *generally*, allow such impositions: 3. Then, any few envious or malicious persons in a church, may bring a scandal unavoidable, upon any church in the world; if what they say and hold should be accounted the church's judgment, where they live: 4. Then the churches of *England* are *all* Antinomian and Familistical; because, on our knowledge, such Letters have been written from some in these churches as [who] professedly maintain such opinions. How absurd these conclusions would be, let any indifferent man judge!" P. 5.

The reader is now fully prepared to enter upon the "Brief Narration" and the "Answer" to it, respectively; the former occupying here

^a "I assure you we have a great need of help in the way of Discipline, and we hope that we shall receive much light from you. My cousin [James] Noyse and myself have seen such confusion of necessity depending on the Government which hath been practised by us here, that we have been forced much to search into it within these two or three years. And although we hold a fundamental power of Government in the People, in respect of election of ministers, and of some acts in cases extraordinary, as in the want of ministers; yet we judge, upon mature deliberation, that the ordinary exercise of Government must be so in the Presbyters as not to depend upon the express votes and suffrages of the People. There hath been a convent, or meeting, of the Ministers of these parts, about this question at Cambridge, in the Bay; and there we have proposed our arguments, and answered theirs; and they proposed theirs, and answered us: and so the point is left to consideration. Also, concerning admission of Members, we hold, the rule must be so large that the weakest Christians may be received; and there was, according to appearance, much conjunction in this particular. . . From Newbury, in New England. Dec. 17, 1643." p. 3, 4. "The True Copy of a Letter written by Mr. Thomas Parker, a Learned and Godly Minister in New England, unto a Member of the Assembly of Divines now at Westminster: Declaring his judgment touching the Government practised in the Churches of New England.—*Imprimatur*, Ja. Cranford.—Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 4. This, the only son of Robert Parker, a noted Puritan divine, "came over to New England in the year 1634: . . he departed . . April, 1677, in the eighty-second year of his age. . . Mr. Parker, and his colleague [Noyse,] both considered the Sabbath as beginning the evening preceding; . . being asked, 'Why he adopted a practice different from his opinion,' [he] replied, 'Because I dare not depart from the footsteps of the flock, for my own private opinion!' . . Though Mr. Noyse fled from the Church of England, he was not so high a republican, in religious affairs, as his brethren in general. He no way approved the governing vote of the fraternity, but took their consent in a silential way." Morse and Parish, *Compendious Hist. of New England*. Edit. Lond. 1808. 8vo. p. 46, 47.

the smaller type in our pages, and the latter being placed below, in the ordinary type.

NAR. Chap. I. Article i. "This is to be observed and remembered all along, That all the churches in New England . . are of *one* and the same way in church-constitution, government and discipline, without any material difference, so that what may be truly said of any one of them may be believed of them all.—Ans. to 32 Q p. 82; J. C. to A. H., J. W. in Answ. to 10 Q.; J. D. to L. H.: so all affirm *uno ore*."

"Many of these Letters cited, speak contrary one to another, as himself well knows, and his 'Narration' fully expresseth: therefore it is impossible that his Letters, which speak contraries, can be a sufficient ground of testimony for our church-way, which is but only 'one!'" T. W. p. 6. "He will, against all common sense, needs make us as much differing from the churches of England, as the most rigid Brownists, yea, in some respects, more; and this, he strongly contends for, though we, professedly, in our writings, preachings, practices, manifest the contrary; and testify, as often as occasion serves, the great dislike of their rigid separation." T. W. p. 8. "As in our judgment, we much differ from them, so in several particulars of moment, we practise what the Separatists, properly so called, will not do; as hearing, preaching, praying in the Assemblies in England, and also in private communion with them, etc. . . It is well known, we differ from them in opinions and grounds of our Practice; and how we have opposed rigid Separation in that very point, let our own writings witness, Disc. of Cov. p. 36—38, 52. Here note, once for all, he saith that the churches in New England are 'of one and the same way' in Discipline, . . and this he would have 'remembered all along' his book: I hope he will not start from this afterward; I pray him to mind it." T. W. p. 10, 11.

Art. ii. "Yet they have no Platform solemnly agreed upon amongst them: but only they have all acted themselves into one and the same way.—J. W. in Ans. to 10 Q.; V. S. to W. R.— . . It is a wonder, that no other churches in the world should see that light which yet all the churches in New England, and all their members, do so clearly see as to practise uniformly, without difference; much more, that all other churches should oppose it. If [it be] by imitation, and precedent, one following another, then, *query*, Whether this be not a more rational course and likely to be less erroneous, That the churches should jointly consider of, agree upon and in writing set down a set Platform, according to reason, and Scripture rule, to be observed amongst them, rather than to tie themselves so to precedent, which, if closely followed, is slavish, and worse; if loosely, will soon breed differences, if not divisions: and it is not unknown, that some such have been already amongst them."

"We hold it not unlawful to have a 'Platform' of church-government; that is, a Confession of the Discipline of Christ collected out of Scripture and set down in writing: yet we see no grounds to impose such a Platform upon churches, but leave them to their liberty therein, because—we know not that—Christ ever enjoined it; and therefore we desire W. R. not to stumble at our churches, much less take upon him, so masterly, to control us, because we have it not. He wonders how we so soon fell into such an 'exact' form of Discipline without a Platform: we answer him, yea, he tells us himself,—We had it from that 'Pattern' of wholesome words written in the Scriptures, God's good Spirit opening our eyes to see it! And some others also,—laying aside prejudice, and humbly setting themselves to wait on God for light,—may come to see an exacter form of Discipline than, it may be, hitherto they have

done ! But, Why do not 'other churches in the world,' saith he, besides yourselves, see this way ; but 'all oppose it ?' Blessed be God, it is not so : . . . and even England is coming nearer it by many steps of late than before. He that hath brought them from Episcopacy, imposed Forms, and popish Ceremonies, etc., can carry them on further ! . . . But we 'tie' ourselves to a 'Precedent ;' why not to a 'Platform ?' . . . 'All' our churches, saith he, 'in New England,' and 'their members,' so 'clearly see' the 'shining' light of Discipline by a 'clear evidence of the way revealed' to them, and yet do 'tie themselves' to a 'Precedent.' Is not here a contradiction ? For if we all have full clear 'shining light,' then we need no spectacles of a 'Precedent ;' or if we 'tie' ourselves to a 'Precedent,' it is because we conceive we have not full and clear 'light' of our own ! But we have had 'divisions' amongst us : These 'divisions' were not caused by our church-discipline, but by certain vile 'opinions' brought to us from England. . . . Through rich mercy, they are, long since, subdued by the light and power of His Truth. O that you could say the same of all the *loose* opinions here [in England], if the will of God were so ; for which we sigh daily to Heaven on your behalf, and dare not reproach you with it. When these 'divisions' did *fall*, it was while our Discipline *stood* ; which shows that our Discipline bred them not, but destroyed them rather." T. W. p. 11, 12.

Art. iii. "The reason why they have no set Platform agreed upon is rendered by some of them, to be because such a one is unnecessary ; yea, inconvenient, if not utterly unlawful ; at least, so as to be imposed on the churches : as J. W. in Ans. to 16 Q. implieth, where he saith, 'We all walk in the same way, but not by any public and solemn agreement, as prescribing to any what to do.'—See the Ans. to 32 Q., p. 63, 64. at large.—. . . If a tyrannical and imperious imposition of a Platform, be so evil in their eyes,—as also it is in ours,—then, why do they so rigorously press others that come amongst them to such a perfect conformity to their precedent ; in that, they permit no man whatsoever to be a member in any of their churches, or partake with them in any church fellowship, unless he exactly enter in their way of entering and walk in their order ; nor will own others as sister churches that differ from them,—though but in some things,—in church-discipline ? . . . Is not this, really, a more rigid imposition of their pattern, than any church ever used in urging of their Platform ? . . . *Objec.*, There is a Platform sent over lately, called 'The Way of the Churches in New England :'^a *Ans.* True, but . . . it is compiled by one particular man ; not consented to by the rest, as from thence we are informed, and therefore warned, by some of themselves, so to look at it, and no otherwise."

"We appeal . . . from W. R. in a distemper, to the same man in his right mind, to tell us now, ingenuously, if this be a good argument, By one man's writing to prove the churches' judgment ! No, saith W. R., it is not ; for such a book, saith he, called our 'Way of the Churches,' proves not that they hold 'a Platform,' etc. ; and why ? because it was 'compiled by one particular man, and not consented to by the rest !' What can be more full ?" T. W. p. 6. "But we forbear giving of our privileges to such as conform not to our 'way.' . . . It is no more than all other societies in the world do, who first require conformity before they permit to any the enjoyment of their liberties. Do we any more herein, than the Reverend Assembly themselves at this day, who would not willingly admit unto church employments and

^a See a subsequent chapter.

privileges any of a contrary judgment in point of Discipline? And yet, I hope you will not say that either these or those exercise a 'rigour!' But we will not 'own' such as our 'sister churches,' that 'differ from' us, 'though but in some things,' in 'church-discipline!' Do not the churches in England 'differ from' us, not only in 'some things,' but in many; as W. R. himself saith? And yet we 'own' them as 'sister churches;' witness his own quoted authors; Disc. of Cov. p. 36, at large; Mr. Cotton's printed Letter: all which, affirms in effect, and some in words, that we bless 'the womb' that bare us, and 'the paps' that gave us suck! [Luke xi. 27]. . . Yet, we more *rigidly impose* our 'Pattern' than any churches ever did! How great an aspersion this is, I leave others to judge, and the Lord himself to convince him of. Why, hath there ever been so much as any attempt, amongst us, to suspend, excommunicate, deprive, banish, imprison, any, for dissenting from us in matters of Discipline, as of late in England for Nonconformity? Or, to raise a bloody war for Bishops and a service-book, as against our Brethren in Scotland? Or, to slander, falsify, authors; render many churches odious to the world, as W. R. himself hath done in this book, merely for difference from him in point of church-government? We have, indeed, civilly and ecclesiastically, censured divers there amongst us; but it was for obstinacy in weighty points in religion, sedition in the state, scandalous practices, as also manifest contempt of the churches of Christ there; but not any for inconformity in church-discipline!" T. W. p. 13.

Chap. II. Art. i. "They currently hold that there is no visible church of Christ now, in the days of the Gospel; but a particular church, which may consist of a very small number, as seven, eight, or nine persons, but may not exceed the number of so many as conveniently may and ordinarily do meet together in one congregation, in the same place and at the same times, for the solemn worship of God, to their mutual edification.—Ans. to 32 Q. p. 9, 10, 43;^a Cott. Cat. p. 1;^b Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62;^c R. M. to W. R.; H. W. to Master B.

See Johns. Plea, p. 250; Rob. Apol. p. 12; Rob. Justif. p. 107, 108, 111.

. . . How can so few, either employ, or ordinarily maintain, officers of so many sorts as themselves hold necessary in every church? and, if they cannot have officers, how should they have church-ordinances regularly? It may be a query, Whether this 'particular' church may, lawfully, be no more in number than one only congregation; since the apostles' churches,—most, at least, if not all,—consisted of so many thousands as possibly could not meet all conveniently together 'in the same place and at the same times:'. . . for which, see more in Mr. Rutherford's and Mr. Ball's late Treatises."..

"Though the quoted authors say, there is no church, properly so called, wherein ordinances may be administered, but 'a particular church' only; yet, we acknowledge also, in *some* 'sense,' a domestical church,—'To the church in thy house,' Phil. 2;—and a universal church consisting of visible believers, according to 1 Tim. iii. 15: and this himself grants, we hold,—Marg. 2, Art. ii,—Why then? doth he say, [T. W. p. 14.]

Art. ii. "Therefore they deny all national and provincial churches, much more a universal visible church in any sense.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62, 63, 66; Apol. p. 7, 23; R. M. to E. B. p. 2.

Rob. Justif. p. 217.

^a By Richard Mather. 1643.

^b See back, p. 155.

^c See back, p. 20. . .

“He stumbles at the smallness of the ‘number’ of members in our churches, at their first creation; ‘seven, eight, nine,’ saith he: and on this string he harps four or five times at least in this book. What ‘number’ expressly shall make a church, is not set down in Scripture: in Adam and Noah’s time, when there was not above ‘seven, eight,’ or ‘nine’ persons, will he deny the being of a church? And what will he make of Christ’s family, where were not above twelve besides himself? and, of the first foundationals of the famous church of Ephesus, who ‘were about twelve,’ Acts xix. 1, 7? And Beza in that place, saith, Paul then planted a church among the Ephesians. When our number is thus small, it is only in the very first infancy of it; it abides not so, but members are speedily and daily added until they be—as he blames us for not being—‘a complete organical body.’ Hence those objections also in his margin, 2, Art. i., are answered; of want of employment and maintenance for officers, in regard of their small number.” T. W. p. 14.

Art. iii. “Also they deny all representative churches; whether the officers of one particular congregation representing that church in the judicature within itself, or the commissioners of several churches meeting together in a compound presbytery—or synod—representing all those churches by whom they are sent.

Rob. Justif. p. 162.

Yet sometimes themselves are forced to use commissioners or messengers to represent the whole body absent: as at the constitution of any new church. . . So in their private examinations of members to be admitted. . . Especially, in the late Synod at Cambridge, in New England. And always that part of the church which is present, includes others that are absent, by representation; and the males, the women.”

“It is because we know no rule to set the ‘officers’ in the room of their whole church, and the ‘presbytery’ in the place of all their churches, to bind the one or the other to stand to their decrees, unless we had apostles on earth again for church-officers; yet even they were very tender in this point: . . He saith, Marg. 2. Art. i., ‘The apostles’ churches consisted of many thousands.’ Not in the first beginnings; for in the greatest church, the number was small enough at first, in comparison; Acts i. 15:—and this is the time of our churches we now speak of.—Their ground was sudden, and by an extraordinary way; certain thousands being added in two days; and so necessity enforced their abode together at present. They continued not long so great a body, but were soon dispersed by Saul’s persecution of them, Acts viii. 1. While they did hold together they might, possibly, meet to edification, as well as in some of our churches here in London, as Cripplegate, Olive’s, Sepulchre’s, and others; where the ministers’ voice may reach to edification four, five, six, seven thousand souls every Lord’s day. Therefore for him to say ‘it is not possible,’ is too large. He tells us our churches cannot be gathered ‘in country villages,’ especially of such ‘choice members,’ where so few saints are. This is the fault of the people, not of the rule, nor of the way. If the saints be thin sown, who can help it? . . They may partake of all ordinances, as they did, except the sacraments; and such as are fit, of those also; in best times and ways as may be ordered for most conveniency.” T. W. p. 15. “He would bear the world in hand, if you will believe him, That our practice doth cross

our principles : but there is no such thing, for here he proves not, neither can, that we deny a church that liberty, which all societies have in the world, that is, to depute and delegate her officers, in some particular cases, as in her name and stead, to represent the whole body: for this is no more than the church of Antioch did, Acts xv. 2, and than ourselves frequently do, in some instances he mentions, and divers others. But, what is this, to the giving those officers generally a power of judicature in and over that church; and, 'a compound presbytery,' in and over all the churches whom, he saith, they represent? Because we deny the latter, do we therefore the former?" T. W. p. 16.

Art. iv. "This particular visible church, they define to this effect, It is a mystical body whereof Christ is the Head; the members, are saints called out of the world and united together into one congregation, by a holy covenant, to worship the Lord and edify one another in all his holy ordinances.—Cott. Cat. p. 1; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 13.

.. Here [is not] any mention of the church-officers, as any part of this definition.

"He knows well, that a 'definition' must accord to the lowest degree of the thing defined; therefore we use to put in only essentials and not all integrals:.. for suppose the 'officers' of a church be taken away, by death, from it; yet, I hope, he will not say, that, in the vacancy, the 'church' ceaseth to be: 'officers' are not simply for the being, but the well-being of a 'church!' See, how he adulterates his quotation, in two or three Articles of this chapter: he saith,—Art. i., we hold there is 'no visible church,' but 'a particular;' but his author, Ans. to 32 Q., p. 10, saith, 'no visible church, properly so called, but a particular!' W. R. leaves out the middle words, just as in Matt. iv. 6; whereby the sense is exceedingly altered, since a church, improperly so called, is yet a church. He saith, we 'currently hold' this, but his author speaks modestly, in these words, 'We know not any, etc.:' Ans. to 32 Q., p. 9. Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 66. He saith, we hold there is no 'universal visible church, in any sense:' but his author, Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 66, saith only, 'We know no such visible catholic church, wherein the seals are to be dispensed.' A man with half an eye may discern this is not square dealing!" T. W. p. 17.

Chap. III. Art. i. "The matter of a true visible church, is either infants or persons of age and understanding.

Art. ii. "In persons of age, they require, first, that they be all real saints, sincere believers, not only having common gifts, but also saving graces; that they be not common but *choice* Christians.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 8, 9; Disc. of Cov. p. 4; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 69, 70; Apol. p. 2, 6, 21, 43; Cott. Cat. p. 1, 4; R. M. to E. B. p. 5, 9.

So Rob. Just. p. 11, 38, 41, 47, 48, 61, 91, 254.

Yea, convincingly such: T. G. to J. G.—Meek and humble spirits; for fear they should abuse their church-power: E. O. to W. R.—Void of insincere ends, in seeking of church-communion: Disc. of Cov. p. 4.—If any others should attempt to be admitted, the church were bound, upon discovery, to repel them: Apol. p. 2—5, 24, 33, 43; R. M. to E. B. p. 5. The reason of which, is rendered, lest they take a harlot into the bosom of Christ, instead of a chaste spouse. If any such, be admitted, they are not true but false matter of the visible church."

".. If by 'choice' he means *eminent* Christians, it is very false; for we accept Christians of the lowest form, and never reject any for want of parts, or eminency of grace, if we can discern in them a heart

smitten with sense of sin and need of Christ, joined with a blameless conversation, though very weak in knowledge and faith, etc., we dare not refuse but embosom them in the Lord : and himself, when he will speak the naked truth, confesseth as much, Art. viii., and tells us what great 'indulgence' we use in the admitting members. Let the reader take notice, that upon perusal of his [W. R.'s] authors quoted, he shall not find any one sentence or word tending to justify his saying herein. He would make men believe that we hold, If any be admitted, that is not a 'real saint,' he is 'false matter' of the visible church. This he boldly affirms, but not one word of proof, nor truth. We hold no such thing ; for a visible saint may be true matter of a visible church, when admitted a member upon his profession of godliness and taking the covenant ; as Achan, Judas, Ananias and Sapphira, were all true matter of the visible, though not of the invisible church ; else they had never been admitted into the churches." . . T. W. p. 18.

Art. iii. " That the church may consist of none but real saints, so far as in them lies, they hold, The church is bound to make strict inquiry and take exact trial of all such persons as are to be admitted into church-fellowship ; yea, so much, and so long, as until they have thoroughly approved their sincerity.—Disc. of Cov. p. 10 ; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 70, Apol. p. 2. 43 ; R. M. to E. B. p. 5 ; R. M. to T. S. : this last, giveth this advice to his friend intending to go over, ' Above all things, let those that come to New England search their estate well towards God, and make their calling sure before they come ; for if men come to offer themselves to be members of any church here, their evidences will be then viewed and scanned, and search will be made what they can say for themselves to show both their cutting off from sin and ingrafting into Christ.' And many other such warnings from thence we have had.

See Barr. Disc. p. 33 ; Rob. Just. p. 255, 256 ; Rob. Apol. p. 81 ; Canne's Necess. of Sep. p. 167.

.. " Seeing the Scripture saith to a particular person, ' If thy brother say, it repenteth me, thou shalt forgive him,' Luke xvii. 3 ; query, Whether the same rule will not, by proportion, reach also to a whole church ? and so, by consequence, to church-admission ? Neither do we read of any such strict examination, in admission of members, mentioned in Scriptures, but that men were accepted upon very easy and general terms. The reason why they keep their church doors so close shut is good and plausible in itself ; but applied to this course, seems to cast an aspersion upon Christ that hath made no such rule of prevention, and upon the apostles and their churches which practised none such that ever we read of. . . "

Art. iv. " In which trial, they use to require, first, Letters of recommendations from other churches, or persons absent.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 28, 29 ; Apol. p. 1. Secondly, Testimony of their own members present, if there be any that know the parties.—Apol. p. 1 ; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 24. Thirdly, Experience of their Conversation amongst themselves ; in taking up of which Experience, sometimes the time is long, if other testimonials be wanting.—E. C. to R. C. Fourthly, They examine them touching their knowledge in the principles of religion.—Ans. to 32 Q. p. 23.

Art. v. " Though some or all the forenamed proofs be given, yet they confide not therein, nor can be satisfied therewith, without a verbal Declaration,—either made by a man's self or else drawn out of him by interrogatories,—touching the manner of his Conversion, from point to point, and what evidences he can show of the truth of his grace, of his sound faith, and sincere repentance.—H. W. to T. S., saith, ' Let none trouble himself for a Certificate ; it will not avail him, whosoever he be that comes—though the best known, and most eminently godly—must be examined, etc.'

.. J. W. to T. S., saith, ' The special things they drive at are to find some degree of Legal terrors, Evangelical mourning for sin, desire after Christ ; and upon what promise the soul was quieted. W. T., to Master B., ' The chief points that the church desires to be satisfied in, are concerning the cutting off from the old Adam and a man's engrafting into Christ ; how the Law hath had its work, how the

Gospel its work; what sight a man hath had of sin, what conviction of former erroneous ways, what despair of salvation in and from themselves, what throwing down and humiliation, etc.? Also, Whether Christ be revealed to them in the ministry of the Word, or any other way? What esteem they have of him; what desire to enjoy him? Whether they have yet closed with their Redeemer in any sweet promise, or be still in a waiting, expecting, condition, staying the time when the Holy Ghost will stir up the act of faith, make up the union, give the assurance, etc.?' The same hand writes, 'The churches here admit none but upon confession of their faith, and a humble commemoration, before God and the church, how God hath wrought with them, and how far and in what manner he hath gone along with them in their vocation, etc.' Now . . . I ask, . . . If it be not impossible for many good souls, fit for church-society, and who have right to church-ordinances, to render such an account and in such manner, to the satisfaction of a multitude, concerning the soundness of their conversion? Yea, I ask, Whether so to exact it, be not a greater usurpation and tyranny over the souls and consciences of men, than the Bishops themselves, though bad enough, did ever exercise? If there must needs be such an account given, both of men's knowledge and grace, were it not better and safer that a set and standing Rule were, by common agreement, made, according to God's Word, for trial of both; and this, one and the same—for substance at least, in all the churches; durable, and to continue the same without variation,—unless upon cogent necessity,—written and recorded, and so made public not only to the churches and their members who are to be measured thereby, but also to other churches whom it may concern to know what their sister churches do, and how they walk in the Lord? . . ."

"He is again besides the truth, for in the churches where we have lived many years, we have seen such a tender respect had to the weaker sex, who are usually more fearful and bashful, that we commit their trial to the Elders and some few others, in private, who, upon their testimony, are admitted into the church without any more ado: and so show more indulgence to them, than W. R. doth to us!" T. W. p. 19.

Art. vi. "This Declaration is made first in private, before either some of the officers or other persons betruſted with the examination of the persons to be admitted: and after, also in public before all the church—though never so many,—and that, so as to the conviction and satisfaction of them all.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 23, 24; Ans. to 9. Pos. p. 62, 70: Apol. p. 2—4; R. M. to E. B. p. 6; J. W. to T. S.

Why may not the officers, or some private men with them, betruſted with their private examination, be ſufficient, and their testimony ſatisfactory, etc.?"

"So they are, frequently, according to your wiſh. That, in the public, their Declaration muſt be 'to the conviction and ſatisfaction of all,' before they can be admitted: it is not ſo; for, though ſome few be unſatisfied, they uſe to ſubmit to the reſt, and ſit down in their votes, unleſs their reaſons be ſuch as may convince the church. For his quotations cited to prove both theſe laſt mentioned, good reader, do us the favour but to ſearch Answer to 32 Queſt. p. 23, 24, and Ans. to 9 Queſt. [Pos.] p. 62, 70, and you will find them to juſtify him ſo far as not to afford him any one word, or ſo much as ſhow and countenance! All I ſay to W. R. is this, How can this ſtand with ſimplicity and truth?" T. W. p. 19.

"Multitudes of our English in New England, yea, the major part of them are there out of church order, and ſo both they and theirs live little better than heathen; ſome of which before they went, were here reputed good folk, and godly people; but is not this our brethren's rigour one of the cauſes thereof? . . . That many amongſt them are out of the church, ſee Apol. p. 33, 36; Ans. to 32 Q. p. 7; Maſter F. to J. B., E. O. to W. R.; and ſome good ones too, J. P. to W. R., A. M. to Maſter C."

“He would make men believe, Art. viii., that ‘sometimes’ we go contrary to our former ‘rigour,’ by using ‘great indulgence’ in our admitting members; as if we were not consistent to ourselves and principles, through inconstancy: and upon this, taxes us, in the margin, for so doing. Do but mark his dealing in this his proof of our inconstancy; for the self-same author and page he quoted to prove the ‘rigour’ of our admissions, he cites to prove our ‘indulgence.’ Ans. to 32 Q. p. 8, he brings this for the one and the other, as if the same pen had written contradictions in the same page; yet no show of any such thing will appear if you peruse the place!” T. W. p. 19.

Art. vii. “When any member of any of the churches, of their own way, go from one church to another, only as travellers or sojourners, for the time, they are admitted to sacraments, only bringing with them Letters of recommendation from their own church.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 29. But when any such member comes from one of their churches to another, to be admitted as a fixed member there, then he is not admitted,—notwithstanding any Letters, etc. . . —without such a new Examination as aforesaid; and as if he had never been examined, nor admitted into church-society before.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 29, 30; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62; Apol. p. 2, 7, 9, 35.

.. By this strict course, [regarding ‘travellers,’ etc.,] they tell us, they have seen much *good* to follow, both in the discovering and cashiering of some unsound both in opinion and grace, and in the convincing, humbling, and converting, of others.—Apol. p. 3. 35; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 69. . . They do not tell us what *evil*: how many godly have been kept out of church-society by this means!”..

“Though we hold it a convenient thing,—especially for such as live far off, and altogether unknown to any of the church where he desires participation of the Supper,—to bring a testimonial with him, yet it is a constant and usual thing, especially if any of the church knows them, to accept members of other churches, upon their desire, without any Letters testimonial: and the author quoted, does him the favour rather to seem to speak contrary to him than for him, for saith the Answer to 32 Q. p. 29, 30, ‘We require Letters testimonial from the Congregations in Old England for such as come from thence, before we admit them to the sacraments; whereas such as come from one church to another in New England, we receive, because these churches in New England are better known to us than the other.’ See how this testimony favours him!” T. W. p. 19.

Art. viii. “Notwithstanding all this rigour and strictness, sometimes they will assure us that the churches use great indulgence in their trial, and stoop unto very low terms, that they may take men into church-fellowship.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 8., ‘The known godly, are presently admitted, upon their own desire.’ W. T. to Mr. B. saith, ‘If a man be humble, and have an earnest desire, though he be but in a waiting condition, if in other things he make conscience of his ways,’ he knows ‘no man of wit will deny him to become a member.’ The same man, to P. H., ‘If your ministers were here, they would not think us too strict but too remiss in discipline.’ ‘I think, in time, we shall grow like Old England!’ E. C. to R. C. But of their abatements, see after, more particularly.

If it be the mind of God, that they should be so strict. . . how can they remit any degree of that rigour?”..

Art. ix. “Thus far of the first, which is the main thing, they require in persons to be admitted into church-fellowship; namely, True and real saintship. A second is, That they be such as can cleave together both in opinion and affection.—Disc. of Cov. p. 4. And, that there be a suitableness and sweetness of spirit in them, apt to close one with another.—J. Cott. Notes of the Church, fol. p. 2, 3.

“This is very good and comfortable when it may be had; but suppose some differ

from us in opinion in points inferior: may they not be admitted and tolerated in that, so long as they be not turbulent or infectious? And what, if men be of more sour and cynical dispositions, by nature, must nobody admit them into church-fellowship, . . . though they should have truth of grace, . . . because of some invincible remains of a harsh and crabbed constitution?"

Art. x. "A third is, That they cohabit together as near as may be, for their better mutual watching one over another.—Disc. of Cov. p. 4; Cott. Cat. p. 5.

. . . Whereas our Law hath tied all men, dwelling within such and such precincts [parishes,] to meet together in such a place, under such a ministry, . . . some of them, contrary to this good Law, destroy these . . . orderly consociations, pull asunder our true, though not pure, Christian churches, and patch up others of their own making, gotten some from one parish, etc., some from another; . . . whereby other pastors are robbed of their sheep, etc." . . .

Art. xi. "A fourth thing is, They must be such as know what belongs to church-covenant, and approve thereof.—J. P. to W. R.; T. G. to J. G.

Therefore, if any man deny or but doubt of this church-covenant,—namely, as distinct from the Covenant of Grace,—their church-doors are for ever shut against him. God help me, then!"

Art. xii. "Lastly, They must seek and desire church-membership and church-fellowship—namely, in their way of it.—Apol. p. 11, 39; Disc. of Cov. p. 4; J. W., Ans. to 10 Quest.; J. W. to T. S.; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 8; Cott. Cat. p. 4. Which, if they do not, they account them despisers of it; yea, wicked and graceless persons, and so unworthy of it.—Apol. p. 25—27, 34; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 69; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 21; J. W., Ans. to 10 Q.; Disc. of Cov. p. 28.

This is the harshest of all the rest. May not such forbearance proceed out of humility or modesty—though unwarrantable,—ignorance, or tenderness of conscience; as scrupling their covenant, and the courses following it, discouragement, or the like? Men forget the royal law of love, To do as they would be done unto. Some call sharply, for charity; charity to themselves, that show but slender charity to others."

"The last and worst report of all the rest, is in Article xii., where he reports, that if any amongst us do not 'seek and desire' church-fellowship, in our 'way;' we 'account them despisers of it; yea, wicked and graceless persons.' To which I answer, with detestation, God forbid! We speak it as knowing God hears all our words. We hope we are far from such a spirit; for we well know that many gracious and precious saints there amongst us, may, and sometimes do for a good time, abstain from seeking and desiring church-fellowship, for other grounds than despite, wickedness, and gracelessness! Sometimes, because they are not settled in a place; sometimes, because they desire more experience of the ministers and people where they should join: some, for want of clear light and full conviction of the church-ways we walk in; and some others, out of many fears about their own spiritual estate before God. . . . See what cause, therefore, he hath, in his marginals to this Article, to upbraid us: . . . whereas he forgets the law of 'love' and trust [truth] also. . . . And for these quotations cited, of Ans. to 32 Q., p. 21; and Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 69; we boldly say, and do challenge him with it, that there is not one word therein to bear him out; and, therefore, I do here lay this report upon himself as the raiser of it; let him defend it, or humbly take the blame.

"Besides these blurs he puts upon us in the text, he attempts no less, in his large marginal comments on this chapter; by many objections raised against us: . . . as that, we keep our 'church-doors' so close 'shut;' and, why may not 'fair overtures,' and 'shows of grace,' in such as offer themselves, be sufficient for admission? and, what need such narrow

searching and sounding of 'men's hearts' to the bottom? and, that 'Christ' never made such rules; and 'the apostles and their churches' never practised the like; and, that 'real and internal holiness' is not required to make a *member*, but only 'federal and external,' etc. ! Do but see how church-members were wont to be qualified: Matt. iii. 6; Acts viii. 37, 38; xix. 18, 19; Rom. i. 7, 8; xv. 14; Eph. i. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 13; 2 Cor. viii. 5; where is plainly expressed what frame such were of: they confessed their sins; they professed their faith; they believed in the Lord Jesus with all their heart; they confessed and showed their works; they openly burnt as many conjuring books as were worth no less than fifty thousand pieces of silver; they were men beloved of God, called to be saints; full of goodness; filled with knowledge; the faith of some of them spoken of through the world; faithful in Christ Jesus; professed their subjection to Christ; gave up themselves first to the Lord, and then to the church, by the will of God! Now let W. R. speak, is here only 'federal and external holiness?' were here only 'fair overtures' and some 'shows of grace?' But if we go further than his principles carry him, then, we keep our church-doors 'too close;' then he cries out, it is against 'charity,' against 'Christian wisdom,' against 'justice,' and all! And then, why will not 'overtures' and 'shows' serve our turns? I tell you, these 'overtures' and 'shows,' W. R., have done mischief enough already, a man would think, to Christ's kingdom, and to these poor English churches. It is high time, sure, to press on further now than 'overtures:' first you were for Stinted Liturgies, and now plead for 'overtures!' Whither next?".. T. W. p. 20, 21.

"If it seems so 'impossible' for some Christians to give an account of the work of grace in them, what meant Peter to direct all believers to 'be always ready to give an answer to every man,' of the 'hope' that is in them? 1 Pet. iii. 15. . . What if they know not the time, order, and manner of their conversion, yet if they can give any evidence of Christ now in them by the workings of his Spirit for [the] present, though they know not how Christ came into them, it is sufficient. . . 'If any man deny' the church-covenant, or 'doubt' of it, your 'church-doors are shut for ever against him!' We pray you, good W. R., speak not against common sense: how can we possibly admit him into our church-covenant, that denies the church-covenant? Can we make him do what he denies to do? Since God's people must be a 'willing' people, Psal. cx. 3; or, if he doubts of the lawfulness of it [the covenant,] is it lawful for him to enter into it doubtingly, or for us to offer it, seeing 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin,' Rom. xiv. 23? But to say our 'church-doors' are 'for ever' shut against him; is a speech as untrue as harsh.".. T. W. p. 22, 23.

Chap. IV. Art. i. "They hold the Form of a true visible church of Christ, is that which they call 'The Church-Covenant;' whereby all the members of the society are united to Christ and to one another: which, therefore, they count absolutely necessary, essential, and constitutive to and of the True Church.—Disc. of Cov. p. 5—15; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 9, 39; Apol. p. 6, 9, 17, 19—21, 24, 25, 38, 39; Cott. Cat. p. 4. Without this, no true church, nor true church members; but all are harlots and concubines.—Apol. p. 20, 24; Disc. of Cov. p. 14, 18—21, 24. Without it, all men are 'without' the church,—for which, they usually cite 1 Cor. v. 12,—and incapable of any church privilege.—Apol. p. 6, 11, 13, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 38,

39, 42; Disc. of Cov. p. 17, 22, 28; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 11, 21, 24, 38; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 69.

So the Separatists: Rob. Just. p. 75, 79, 56, 81, 82, 85, 86, 110, 210, 207, 231, 257, 351.

This point, of church-covenant, is worthy of deep consideration; for it will touch the *freehold*—not only of our English churches, but also—of all the churches in the world, if this be the rule to try all churches by!"

"He utterly mistakes the subject of the question; for those authors he quotes declare not what it is that makes a 'true' church, but a 'pure' congregational church, as it is refined according to the platform of the Gospel... This one thing being cleared, what will now become of all his marginal collections, exclamations, insultations, on the 1st, 3rd, 8th, Articles. He cries out of our unheard of rigidity, as if we would 'touch the freehold' of the churches of England, etc.: but all his invectives are as arrows shot into the air, for we hold no such thing as he exclaims at... For the quotations he makes for these words ['all are harlots, etc.,'] I marvel his paper blushed not, when he wrote it, because himself did not; for let any man read over the pages as we have done, and see if one can be found so much as savouring of such a thing... He contradicts his own relation, Art. iii., where he plainly saith, 'that many' that be 'within the church-covenant' are not in 'the covenant of grace;' and so, not in Christ: and yet, here he saith that by the 'church-covenant' a man is 'united to Christ'... How can both these be true? This is too frequent with him, to lay things that are contradictory to our charge; and not a word of proof from the authors [cited] as any ground of it!".. T. W. p. 24, 25.

Art. ii. "No other tie, nor all others imaginable, without this [church-covenant,] they conceive are sufficient to knit men together into one church; nor is there any other way of admission into the church but by this: not visible profession, and practice of true holiness, though never so complete and sincere. Therefore they say 'Job and Melchizedek,' with others such eminently godly, 'were yet no members of the visible church, because not within this church-covenant!'—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 66; Disc. of Cov. p. 14; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 28, 37: nor 'baptism;'—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 12: nor 'cohabitation;'—Disc. of Cov. p. 14, 20; nor 'voluntary and usual frequenting the same place of worship; subjecting a man's self to the same officers and laws of government; nor joining himself in all holy fellowship, both public and private, with the same society;'—*Ibid.* p. 21; nor 'the law of the land,' made by the magistrate's authority, with our own implicit consent in Parliament, appointing, That all professors of religion that sit down within such and such precincts, shall be of such a society or church;—Apol. p. 14: nor all these together, without the church-covenant; which only, is sufficient to do it!—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 24; Disc. of Cov. p. 5, 14, 18—21, 24, 25; Apol. p. 19, 24."

"He reports that we hold, That 'joining' ourselves 'in all holy fellowship,' cannot 'knit' a man as a member of a church: and quotes Disc. of Cov. p. 21, for his proof. The author hath not one word to bear him out! We wonder what the man means, to affirm this; for 'joining one's-self in holy fellowship,' he knows is our usual and frequent description of the church-covenant, when we speak most punctually to it; and do commonly, for that end, cite Jer. 1. 5; Acts ix. 26. That very author and page he cites to prove we hold that 'joining ourselves in holy fellowship cannot knit,' etc., speaks directly the contrary, in these words, 'When joining,' saith the author, 'is used for a man's taking on him, voluntarily, a new relation,' as in this case he doth, 'there it always implies a Covenant.'" T. W. p. 25. "In his margent to

Art. ii., 'A strange, yet bold assertion,' saith he, 'spoken . . without good show of reason;' . . that 'Job and Melchizedek' were no members of 'the visible church.' . . All that Ans. to 32 Q., p. 37, saith, is this, 'We make no question of the salvation of Job and his friends, yet it is a great question whether they were of any visible church or not;' and gives his reason; 'seeing the visible church, in those times, seemed to be appropriated to the posterity of Abraham, etc.; of whose line it cannot easily be proved that all these men did come.' And all the other cited author,—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 66 [67]—saith, is this, 'We nowhere read,—there is this reason—that Melchizedek, Job and his four friends, 'were circumcised; neither do we believe they were.' Now see whether we 'say' and *conclude* that these holy men were in no church; if we *boldly* assert it, etc.!" T. W. p. 29.

Art. iii. "This Covenant, they hold to be distinct from the Covenant of Grace; so as that many which are within the covenant of grace,—that is effectually, yea, and visibly, called, too,—are not within the church-covenant, and so not within the visible church, as Job, Melchizedek, etc., of whom before. And again; many are within the church-covenant and so within the visible church, that are not within the covenant of grace, as hypocrites in the church.—Apol. p. 5, 6, 14; Disc. of Cov. p. 3, 16.

. . When an express vocal covenant is held forth and with all eagerness pressed, on us and on all churches, as a Divine ordinance particularly commanded in Scripture; absolutely necessary; essential, and constitutive to a true church; without which, there is no true church, . . and without which there is no right unto nor orderly participation of any church duty or ordinance: and this so obligatory, that it is *piaculum* to remove from that society, with which one is in covenant, without their general consent, sought, at least, as after is showed: and not only so, but also Letters are sent over with strong lines, to dissuade our people from living any longer in the way they have done; out of church-order, because out of church-covenant: Sermons are likewise preached, books printed, and private discourses made; and in all these, arguments artificially used, and passionately and persuasively urged, yea, the Scriptures themselves forced to speak for their church-covenant as a Divine ordinance, etc.: I say, When it is thus held forth and urged on us, no marvel if it be not entertained without much agitation; yea, if it meet with much opposition, and that amongst the godly and learned, both persons and churches."

Art. iv. "Yet sometimes they tell us, It is not distinct altogether, or in substance, but in some respects only; as a part from the whole, this being a branch of that.—Disc. of Cov. p. 3, 7, 8, 12, 26, 28; Apol. p. 8, 31, 43: a 'voluntary' profession of subjection thereunto;—Apol. p. 22, 24; Disc. of Cov. p. 18: especially, to that part thereof which concerns church-fellowship and church-duties;—Disc. of Cov. p. 4, 7, 8, 26; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 75: with application to this particular church only to which one is now to be joined by this covenant.—Disc. of Cov. p. 10, 15, 28; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 75.

. . As this covenant is destructive to our churches, so it is apt to cause schisms and separations of one church from another even amongst themselves. It is a partition wall, as one calls it, built up to hinder that communion that ought to be among churches, and that care that one church and member ought to have of another; here being so strict a tie to the duties belonging to our own church and the members thereof, but not a word of any duty to be performed to other churches or their members: so that if a member of the same church with myself want watching, counsel, reproof, etc., my covenant binds me to perform accordingly; but if one of another church do need as much, and I have fit opportunity, etc., yet, by this covenant, I have nothing to do with him, he is 'without' to me:—1 Cor. v. 12."

"In Articles iii. and iv. he would make as though we ourselves speak contrary to ourselves. In the one place, he saith, we 'hold' our church-

covenant 'to be distinct, etc. ;' in the other place, that 'it is not distinct, etc.' But we must digest grosser things than this, in his narrations. Consult with his author, and you shall see nothing to countenance him; yea, he quotes the same author for both." T.W. p. 25.

Art. v. "And this covenant is made, by every member, both with God and the church; and by the church also, back again, with every member.—Disc. of Cov. p. 4, 10, 12; J. W. Ans. to 10 Q.; R. M. to W. R."

Art. vi. "And thus they define it:—All the middle part of this definition, explains the matter of a true church; of which, in the former chapter: only the beginning and end, do show the nature of the covenant, which they call the Form, of which here, in this chapter:—It is a solemn and public Promise, before the Lord and his people, Whereby a company of Christians called, by the power and mercy of God, to the fellowship of Christ; and, by his providence, to dwell together; and by his grace, to love and cleave together in the unity of faith and brotherly love; and desirous to partake, according to the will of God, in all the holy ordinances of God together, in one congregation; Do bind themselves to the Lord, to walk in all such ways of holy worship to him, and of edification one towards another, as God himself hath required, in his Word, of every church of Christ and the members thereof.—Apol. p. 5; Disc. of Cov. p. 3.

The words are good and fair; but he that takes this covenant, had need to consider that, in the sense of them that give it, The ways of God, are the ways of church-constitution and popular government; which, if he be not, upon good ground, satisfied that they are indeed the ways of God, then how can he safely engage himself to them by this covenant; and that, not only to be a patient to tolerate what he cannot mend, but even to act with them also in the same? Our Brethren conceive that a minister, in swearing canonical obedience, in omnibus licitis et honestis, to a Bishop, did thereby justify Episcopacy; and do not, by the same reason, all that take this covenant, justify Popularity and Independency?"

Art. vii. "The properties hereof: It is sacred, not civil.—Disc. of Cov. p. 3, 4. It must be public, before all the church.—Disc. of Cov. p. 4, 17; R. M. to W. R. Vocal, and express.—J. W. Ans. to 10 Q.; Apol. p. 45. So firmly binding, as that it cannot be loosed without the consent of the church. Of which, see more hereafter."

"He tells us we hold our church-covenant must be 'vocal;' but proves it not by any one testimony we can read; and it is contrary, we are sure, to our constant practice that admits members into the church by a covenant agreed to by their silence only. And as it is contrary to our practice, so to our writing in the Discourse of the Covenant, which expressly saith that 'silent consent is sufficient,' and there proves it by Gen. xvii. 7, and Deut. xxix. 10, etc." T. W. p. 25.

Art. viii. "After all the rigorous exacting of this covenant, sometimes they mollify the matter, and tell us, That an agreement, or consent, to be members of this or that society, and to walk with them in church-fellowship; will serve and is equivalent.—Apol. p. 32, 44; Disc. of Cov. p. 21—23; T. G. to J. G. And sometimes, instead of exacting this covenant, they only inquire what is in men's intention; whether they 'intend' to do so or not; and if they intend it, that sufficeth.—Mr. W. to Mr. P. And as for us, they sometimes acknowledge that our consent to the law of the land, made by king and parliament, appointing that all such as sit down within such precincts shall be of this or that parish or church, is an implicit covenant.—Apol. p. 14: and sometimes, that our promise to believe and walk according to our Articles of Religion, is sufficient.—Disc. of Cov. p. 40."

"Whereas he had reported before, of our 'rigorous exacting,' etc.; it must be 'vocal, and express,' or it would not serve our turn; nay, no churches at all without this explicit covenant; etc.: now, he pulls down all he hath built, and tells us that we hold that a bare 'consent and

agreement, etc., will serve; and that men's implicit intentions, etc., may suffice! He grossly falsifies his author brought to prove this mincing of the covenant,—Disc. of Cov. p. 21, 22,—where is not one word that way; and, which much aggravates, he still quotes the very same author and page, for our mincing of the covenant, that he did, in Art. i., for our rigorous exacting of it! He slandereth us, to make the world believe we run contrary ways: sometimes by over 'rigorous exacting,' etc.; sometimes again, that .. we bring it so low, almost to nothing! Whereas, in all our writings, I profess it solemnly, there is no show at all of any such differing practice. Hence, also, the ground being rotten, his marginal construction falls on his own head. He doth not only abuse his author and us, but himself also, who said, in Chap. I. Art. ii. that New England Churches walk in 'the same way,' without any material difference: and yet this is the third time he hath taxed us for grossly differing from ourselves. How can these things be? See, how many gross falterings in one poor Article; what are in all his book?" T. W. p. 25, 26.

Art. ix. "This covenant amongst them, though for substance of matter it be all one in all their churches, yet in form of words it is diverse in divers churches, but in the same church it is ever in one and the same form of words as well as matter, and therefore put in writing; and when any one is admitted, it is then read, either by the party himself that is admitted, or else unto him by some other man, whereunto he is to give his assent.—R. M. to W. R.; Apol. p. 5.

.. What is this better or more lawful than such a set form of Prayer; especially since this covenant is imposed as an ordinance of God, and absolutely necessary so as no book-prayer is?.. And if one form of covenant be lawful for all the churches consociated; why not one form of Liturgy, or Directory for Worship, also?"

"He was hard driven for arguments, else he could never have produced this as a ground for set forms of Prayer in churches: for, he might know, there is a large breadth of difference betwixt a covenant and a prayer. The one is presented to God himself only; the other, to man also... We have express warrant, in Scripture, for a form of words and writing of a covenant,—which is the very thing *we* are blamed for;—see Neh. ix. 38; and x. 29—39... Let him show us the like warrant, in the Word, for a Liturgy, or set form of book-prayer, for a congregation. I much wonder that a grave, learned, man,—especially in such reforming times as these,—should so far forget himself as to make such parallels, and still talk of Liturgies! He saith, in this marginal, that the church imposeth that set form of covenant, etc... It is never imposed on any:.. if he hath not light and ground, he is, in no case, forced to it!.. Any church hath and taketh liberty, as they shall see just cause .. to alter it [their covenant,] and renew it before the Lord; and bind not themselves, to continue in any oversight because they once fell into it: and some churches have so done." T. W. p. 30, 31.

Art. x. "One or two of their Forms I will here insert, that the reader may the better, by example, take up their sense touching this covenant.

The Covenant of the English church at Rotterdam,—as is reported to us;—renewed, when Mr. H. P. [Hugh Peters] was made their Pastor; was to this effect:—"We, whose names are hereunder written, having a long time found, by sad experience, how uncomfortable it is to walk in a disordered and unsettled condition, etc.; do renew our Covenant in Baptism, and avouch God to be our God. We

resolve to cleave to the true and pure worship of God ; opposing to our power, all false ways : we will not allow ourselves in any known sin, but will renounce it so soon as it is manifested from God's Word so to be ; the Lord lending us power : we resolve to carry ourselves, in our several places of government and obedience, with all good conscience, knowing we must give an account to God : we will labour for further growth in grace, by hearing, reading, prayer, meditation, and all other ways we can : we mean not to over-burden our hearts with earthly cares ; which are the bane of all holy duties, the breach of the Sabbath, and the other Commandments : we will willingly and meekly submit to Christian Discipline, without murmuring, and shall labour so to continue ; and will endeavour to be more forward, zealous, faithful, loving and wise, in admonishing others : we will labour, by all our abilities, for the furtherance of the Gospel, as occasion shall be offered to us : we promise to have our children, servants, and all our charge, taught the ways of God : we will strive to give no offence to our brethren by censuring them rashly, by suspicions, evil speakings, or any other way : lastly ; we do protest not only against open and scandalous sins, as drunkenness, swearing, etc., but also against evil company and all appearance of evil, to the utmost of our power."

"The Covenant of the Church of Christ at Salem, was renewed to this effect : We, whose names are hereunder written, Members of the present Church of Christ at Salem, etc., solemnly in the presence of God, etc., renew that Church Covenant which we find this church bound unto at their first beginning, viz., We covenant with the Lord and one with another, and do bind ourselves, in the presence of God, to walk together in all the ways of God, according as he is pleased to reveal Himself to us in his Word ; and do, more explicitly, in the fear of the Lord, profess and protest to walk as followeth : We avow the Lord to be our God, and ourselves his people, in the truth and simplicity of our spirits : we give up ourselves to the Lord Jesus Christ and the Word of his grace, for the teaching, sanctifying, and ruling of us in matters of Worship and Conversation ; resolving to cleave to Him alone for life and glory, and oppose all contrary ways, Canons and Constitutions of men, in his worship ; we promise to walk with our Brethren and Sisters, in this Congregation, with all watchfulness and tenderness ; avoiding all jealousies, suspicions, backbitings, censurings, provokings, secret risings of spirit against them ; but in all offences, to follow the Rule of the Lord Jesus, to bear and forbear, give and forgive, as he hath taught us : in public, or private, we will willingly do nothing to the offence of our Church ; but will be ready to take advice for ourselves and ours, as occasion shall be presented : we will not, in the Congregation, be forward either to show our own gifts or parts, in speaking, or scrupling, or there to discover the failings of our Brethren or Sisters, but attend an orderly call thereunto ; knowing how much the Lord may be dishonoured, etc., by our distempers and weaknesses in public ; we bind ourselves to study the advancement of the Gospel in all truth and peace, both in regard of those that are within and without ; noway slighting our sister-churches, but using their counsel as need shall be, not laying a stumbling-block before any : we hereby promise to carry ourselves in all lawful obedience to those that are set over us in Church and Commonwealth, knowing how well-pleasing it will be to the Lord, etc., we resolve to approve ourselves to the Lord in our particular callings ; shunning idleness as the bane of any state, nor will we deal hardly or oppressingly with any : we will, also, to our best abilities, teach our children and servants the knowledge of the Lord and his will that they may serve Him also."

"All things in these two Forms, in a fair construction are very good, but some things are subject to a harsh construction. . . We have, in the latter, a particular promise not to 'be forward in speaking in public, or scrupling.' By which it appears that they are allowed, when called, publicly both to speak ; that is as I understand it, to prophesy ; and to scruple, that is, to propound questions, make objections, etc., else, what need a law, to restrain them from doing it uncalled ? . . But what differs this law, in force, from an Ecclesiastical Canon ? but that Canons are now grown out of request, that church-covenants may be the better cried up !" . .

"He sets down two of the Forms of the Church-Covenants ; which, any savoury and gracious spirit, viewing over and surveying the godly simplicity of them, cannot, one would think, but approve and relish.

Yet see this man's spirit, so prejudiced against us and all things we do, that he cannot choose but without reason find fault with divers innocent passages therein ; as that we promise, willingly and meekly, to submit to Christian discipline 'without murmuring!' etc. . . He is angry with us also, p. 18, that we mention not, in our covenant, more particular sins and duties than we do ; and yet is offended that we mention any at all : how shall we please him ? . . He then flies from New England to some particular persons here, who, 'being ministers of churches there,' saith he, p. 19, 'accept of settled [fixed] employments, even charge of souls ;' and how can they 'watch over' their church ? I know but two ministers of the churches there, that are in England at this time ; and how far both these are from settled employment,—much more from taking livings, as these words, 'charge of souls' imply,—God, their own consciences and the people to whom they, at present, preach, can testify ; little to the comfort and credit of any that thus slander them. I advise him to reflect upon his words, and see if there be not something in them to be repented of, and recalled. . . That hand of Providence, that, upon weighty causes, and with their people's consent, first led them hither ; and upon like necessary grounds, beyond expectation, still detains them here ; takes them off, at present, from performing that duty of watchfulness over their people ; as, in like manner, it doth to other persons, that are absent from their families and churches, by long sea voyages, wars, etc." T. W. p. 26, 27.

Art. xi. "This covenant, thus distinguished from the covenant of grace, they hold to be that covenant which is sealed by the sacraments, and, for the sealing and ratifying of which the sacraments were principally ordained of God ; and therefore to be administered only to such as are first entered into this covenant, as seals thereof.—Apol. p. 15, 19, 31 ; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 63, 66. And therefore, that such persons as, by their condition, cannot join in church-covenant, nor live in church-fellowship with a set society, are not bound to partake in sacraments.—Apol. p. 39, 41.

See Rob. Justif. p. 80, 110. Though I do not find the 'Brownists' so solicitously to distinguish between the church-covenant and the covenant of grace, as these our Brethren do.

Here is a piece or two of such divinity, as I never heard or read before ; but uno absurdo dato, mille sequuntur !"

"I stand amazed at this report. . . All his proof we can see is 'Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 63, 66 ;' I will relate the very words : . . 'Baptism,' saith the author, 'serves to seal our justification, as circumcision did ; yet not that alone, but also the whole covenant ;' that is, of grace, 'with all the privileges, as adoption and sanctification, fellowship with Christ ; the salvation of our souls, and the resurrection of our bodies : Acts ii. 38 ; Gal. iii. 26, 27 ; Tit. iii. 5 ; Matt. xx. 23 ; 1 Pet. iii. 21. And not only the covenant of grace, which is common to all believers ; but church-covenant also, which is peculiar to confederates, according to 1 Cor. xii. 13.' Now, here is not said that the church-covenant is the thing 'sealed,' much less the principal end of this ordaining 'the sacraments ;' least of all, that the church-covenant, as distinguished from the covenant of grace, is the principal end of the sacraments : but all that is said is this, That, though justification and the whole covenant of grace, be the principal things sealed in their circumcision and our baptism ; yet 'all the privileges' of the covenant of grace, and the

‘church-covenant also,’ are not without their share and benefit in the sacrament. How far this expression comes short of his assertion, let others judge. Now, see in his marginal note upon this Article . . . I could retort, ‘Here is such an absurd foisting in of untruths as I never hardly read in heathen or christian writers;’ and having taken liberty in a few things at first, now they come in by troops. As he hath had very ill success hitherto all the chapter through, let us see if he will speed any better at the close.” T. W. p. 27, 28.

Art. xii. “Such as were admitted into their churches Infants by the covenant of their parents, are not yet permitted to receive the Lord’s Supper when they come to years, until they have first run through all the foresaid course of public and private examination; profession of faith, declaration of the manner of their conversion, and personal, vocal, express entering into the same covenant as others, of years, have before them done, and as if they had never been received members before.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 20, 21.”

“All that the author—whom only he cites,—saith, is this, that ‘There ought to be a renewing of their covenant, or a new profession of their interest in the covenant, and walking according to it;’ and professeth modestly too, these are but their ‘present thoughts,’ not settled ‘determinatively, for want of occasion to bring it into practice:’ yet he brings him in as speaking conclusively; and, with a lumber of additions, deviations, alterations, of his own putting in: where is now, his running through ‘all the foresaid course,’ etc. ? . Whose words are all these ? The author expressly tells us that ‘Children are entered into church-covenant already, and do but renew their covenant;’ and [but] he saith, They must enter in afresh, as if they had never yet been received at all ! This, we must tell him, is not fair dealing.” T. W. p. 28.

Chap. v. Art. i. “Any small number—almost—of persons,—so fitted as before,—they hold, may lawfully unite themselves into a church body, by entering into the church-covenant aforesaid; and so, may constitute themselves a true visible church of Christ, without any authoritative consent of the Christian Magistrate,—supposing there be one,—or of the neighbouring churches or their ministers.—R. M. to W. R.; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 43.

Rob. Justif. p. 181, 182.

Art. ii. “Yet a law is made in their general court, civil, That no church shall be there set up without the knowledge of the Magistrate and neighbour churches. R. M. to W. R. Yea, as Mr. H. P. informeth us, Not without the consent of five or six of the neighbouring churches at the least.”

“He is at a set, in Art. i. and ii., and their marginals; and falls a wondering at the ‘contradiction’ in them. . . I will do him the favour to help him out of this strait, and salve his credit by telling him, There is no contradiction at all: . . do but distinguish of times, and you untie the knot. For there was a time in New England, for some few years’ space, before such a law was made, and then churches did use to gather without any notice given to magistrates, or other churches. But after the opinions grew on, and experience discovered the danger, there was a law made, That none must constitute any church, but first give notice thereof to magistrates and churches; and since that, this course is duly observed. So both your Articles, W. R., you see are true, and your report honest and right ! yet, withal, let me give you a few animadversions, by way of brotherly counsel: and, I pray you, take them well.

“ See what it is to wrong so many godly saints and faithful churches, upon private various informations and your own mistakes, and so break that ninth commandment of our ever blessed God ! While you live, undertake no more Narratives of ‘ Church Courses ’ in places you are no better acquainted withal ; lest, at unawares, you speak evil of the things you know not ! When a matter lies before you that admits a double construction, be sure you ever take it in the better, and not in the worse sense !

“ In those two reports, you see one good sense, which indeed is the truth, and that I have given you ; another, bad, and that yourself have taken : for when you stood amazed, in your marginals, at the contrariety of the reports, in the conclusion who must be beaten, but either your informer, or else New England churches, for practising such ‘ foul,’ yea, ‘ more foul, contradictions,’ as you are pleased to speak ? And yet note, you see neither he nor they, but yourself only is in all the blame. . . For Art. i. the Ans. to 32 Q., p. 43, there is not one word nor jot to prove that the churches in New England are erected without the magistrates’ cognizance. Then, for the proof of both the Articles—where this contradiction lies—he makes R. M. the father of that monstrous birth of ‘ a foul contradiction.’ Now this R. M. is a godly and reverend teacher of a church there, who would not write such a seeming contradiction without clearing of it some way or other. Ever have we found him sober and wary in all his expressions. . . Now, I beseech you, W. R., . . to consider if this be an act of love towards your dear friend, without his consent to discover his Letters to the world, which were written to you in private, . . as one that reports to you such things for truth as they neither hold nor practise in New England. . . In Articles iii. and iv., to the end of the chapter, he reports, and that truly, excepting some few mistakes, the manner of the first constitution [‘ erecting’] of a [‘ visible’] church in New England.” T. W. p. 32, 33.

Art. iii. “ The persons intending to enter into church-estate do, beforehand, often meet privately amongst themselves, to be inwardly acquainted with each other’s spirits, by conferring, praying together, and mutually examining each other, until they have approved themselves to one another’s consciences in the sight of God : which, when they have thoroughly done in private, then they agree together to enter into a church-estate.—R. M. to W. R ; H. W. to Mr. B.

Art. iv. “ Which before they do, notice is given thereof to the Magistrate, and neighbouring churches, that so such as please may be present at the time and place thereunto appointed.—R. M. to W. R ; H. W. to Mr. B ; J. W. to T. S.

Art. v. “ The number wherewith they usually begin, at the first constitution of every church, is about seven, eight, or nine.—*Ibid.*

Art. vi. “ Notice being given, the magistrate and churches send their messengers or deputies to see how things are carried, and to give them advice, direction, approbation or disapprobation, as they shall see cause.—*Ibid.*

Art. vii. “ The day appointed is kept with fasting and prayer ; and sometimes, if not always, preaching of the Word, which is performed by some of the persons that now come to be combined into this church-society. In the latter end of the day, each of those persons now to be church-ed,—if I may so say,—maketh public profession of his faith ; thereby showing his knowledge and opinion in the grounds and principles of religion, and declaring, from point to point, the work of God upon his soul in his conversion. And all this, in an extemporary—at least—conceived speech ; that is, not in any set form.—*Ibid.*

Art. viii. “ Which, when the messengers of the magistrate and churches have heard and considered, if they be unsatisfied,—or any stander by—they may make

their objections, or propound further questions, as they think fit, until they be satisfied, if it may be.—*Ibid.*

Art. ix. "If in the end, the said messengers be not satisfied, then they, or so many of them, as concerning whom they are not satisfied, either in point of knowledge or grace, are forbidden to enter into church-estate: and so remain still, as before, out of the pale of the church.—*Ibid.*

Art. x. "If at length, they be fully satisfied, and all doubts cleared, then the said persons proceed to enter into church-covenant; which, being written, one of them reads, and all of them subscribe it; and so they are become a true constituted visible church, as they say.—*Ibid.*

Art. xi. "Which being done, the said messengers of the other churches give them the right hand of fellowship, and own them for a sister church: and so, returning back, do make report to the churches that sent them, of all things done, and declare to them that they are to account of them as of a true church of Christ.—*Ibid.*

Marg. note, on Art. x. "If so much time, and so many circumstances, be needful to join seven or eight together into one church; how much time would be requisite to join three thousand together? But our Brethren will acknowledge the apostles went a shorter way to work, Disc. of Cov. p. 29, 30. The reason whereof they tender, 'Because the church was not then subject to so many hypocrites;' which is more than any man knows, when Christ saith, 'Many are called, few chosen.' Matt. xx. 16; many seek, but few find. Besides, this course is used, by our Brethren, not to ordinary Christians only, but to the most godly and approved. I believe, therefore, it was rather because the Holy Ghost had given them no such direction, nor was this manner of church-constitution then hatcht."

"Now, what can W. R., or any man, object against the substance of things done in this relation: some mistakes only excepted, in the laying of it down? One would think the godliness of the persons, joining the plainness and sincerity of their dealing, from the beginning to the end; their care and endeavour to do all 'as becomes saints,' and to begin this holy and weighty business, as in the sight and presence of God, with fasting and prayer; at least, should stop men's mouths from speaking ill of them and their ways: yet W. R. fails in his dealing with them, in divers points, which I desire to advertise him of in the spirit of meekness... He speaks twice of 'the messengers of the magistrate,' Art. vi., viii.:... but there is no such thing done; the magistrates come themselves in person, if they can, or, if not, they send no deputies or messengers: the churches, indeed, send messengers,—commonly their Elders,—to lend them a word of counsel, if they need; being more experienced in those ways than, commonly, new beginners are; to join their prayers with theirs, and to give them the right hand of fellowship... In Art. viii.,... and his marginals upon it,... are many unwise and uncharitable passages laid unjustly to our charge; and all those without any proof at all but only 'H. W.; J. W.;' and who knows where to consult with them?... None may speak a word, but soberly and orderly; and not without leave desired and granted; not how much he will, nor 'what he please,' but things very weighty and necessary, and not of any failings to their disparagement: for if they be unsatisfied with any of them, in point of 'discipline,' or matters of fact, they are first to deal with them in private; seeing they know before, both the persons that are then to join, and the time and occasion of that day's meeting. And, I am confident, never a godly, sober man will write otherwise... Art. ix., is as wide as the rest: for the 'messengers' never arrogated to themselves such power to this day... The most they do at any time, in this

case, is to desire leave to be faithful in interposing their counsel ; and that only when they see very great cause ; and withal, leave them to their Christian liberty.".. T. W. p. 33, 35.

The unusual length of our representation of the present dispute, has induced us to defer the remainder to the next chapter.

CHAP. LII.

RATHBAND AND WELDE, CONTINUED.

THIS chapter being but a continuation of the subject which occupied the chief portion of the chapter preceding, is entered upon without further preface.

Chap. VI. Art. i. "They hold that every such Company, as aforesaid, though never so small, consisting of private persons only,—that is, such as are in no church-office,—and, perhaps, all illiterate too, yet is [are] rightly and immediately intituled to all the privileges of the visible church of Christ, and invested with all ecclesiastical power from Christ, as the first and proper receptacle thereof ; have the keys of the kingdom of heaven committed to them, and may now forthwith administer and partake of all church-ordinances,—except only sacraments,—execute all church-censures ; and, transact all their own businesses within themselves.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 10, 41, 44, 48—50 ; Cott. Cat. p. 10 ; R. M. to W. R. ; R. M. to E. B. p. 4 ; J. W. Ans. to 10 Quest.

See Rob. Justif. p. 106, 107, 112, 121, 122, 125—127, 138, 190, 113, 167, 184, 198, 331 ; Sion's Prerog. Royal, pref. ; Barr. Discov. p. 39.

Art. ii. "The particular sorts of which church businesses are these, Admission of more members into their society : Authoritative admonition of members offending : Binding ; and excommunicating of such as, having offended, prove incorrigible : Loosing, and authoritative forgiving such as, upon admonition and excommunication, do repent ; re-accepting them into the communion of the church again : Making, that is, examining, electing, and with imposition of hands ordaining their pastors, and all other their officers : Unmaking, that is, degrading and deposing them again, when they see cause so to do : Preaching, that is, expounding and applying the Word ; with all authority, to the several uses of their members : And, generally, whatsoever else may concern the edification and spiritual good of that society,—save only, the administration of the seals. And all this, before they have any officers ; or if they have any, yet without reference to them as officers at all. And when they have ministers, then they have sacraments too.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 10, 15, 41, 42, 44, 45, 48—50, 68 ; Cott. Cat. p. 10—12 ; Disc. of Cov. p. 23 ; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62, 70, 76, 77 ; J. W. Ans. to 10 Quest. ; R. M. to E. B. p. 4 ; R. M. to W. R. ; Apol. p. 24.

Rob. Justif. p. 9, 111."

"He reports,—to recite such things only as most need answer, and let the rest pass,—Arts. i. ii., That we 'hold' that Christ hath invested with all power any that are in church-fellowship, etc. If I did delight in retorting, I could say of these words as he, of Holland Ministers' Apology, 'they are a mere gull ;' for almost so many words so many mistakes ! The Narrator should have done well first to have proved all the churches and ministers in New England men out of their wits, and void of common sense ; and then he might more easily have made the world believe they 'hold' and practise such a congeries of absurdities and impossibilities : for, else, many of them there being well known to

be learned, godly, and sober men, no wise men will believe him that they can 'hold' that 'illiterate' men can examine 'pastors' fitness; depose them at pleasure; preach, expound, and apply the Word 'with all authority;' and that, without any 'reference' to their officers at all: and, which is most strange, that Christ himself hath 'invested' these 'illiterate' ones 'with all power' to do all these things!

"It is a received practice amongst us, that when any combine into a church, there is one, at least, of them endued with able parts of human and divine learning; that either hath been a minister in our native country, or is fit to be one amongst them; who usually and frequently preacheth to them after they are united. So that 'all' of them are men not 'illiterate;' and W. R. himself knows this to be true, for the 'Answer to the Thirty-two Questions,' p. 42, . . . directly saith this, in so many words. 'That those 'illiterate' men do examine their ministers' abilities: and that we 'hold' they ought: is another great mistake; for so we should put men upon a work beyond their reach, which were idle. Whereas the truth is, that, if the sufficiency of such men as they intend to call into office, be not well known to them, they use to call in the help and assistance of Elders in other churches, to survey their abilities, and to inform them therein; that thereby, as well as their own experience of them, and discerning of their gifts, they may be able to give in their suffrage for election when the time comes. For their 'unmaking' and 'deposing them again, when they see cause;' we hold and profess it a thing most injurious to Jesus Christ himself in heaven, and to his ministers on earth. . . . We are so far from holding this, that we protest against such practices. And, to show how wary we are in this point, . . . his quoted author speaks, Ans. to 32 Quest. p. 41, 'Our practice is, in removal of ministers, to have counsel and assistance from sister churches.' Whereas he saith also, that we 'hold' that men 'illiterate' should preach 'with all authority,'—which is a work and a task for the ablest ministers to perform,—. . . we deny not, but in some cases some able, judicious, experienced Christians may humbly and soberly, when necessity requires,—as in the want of ministers, and being invited thereunto,—dispense, now and then, a word of exhortation to their brethren: this is far enough from 'preaching,' in an ordinary way, 'with all authority;' which are words of his own, put in without any ground. But, for him to add that we 'hold' they may thus preach when they 'have' officers, and that 'without' any 'reference' at all to them! is extremely contrary to our practice, and furthest from the truth. . . . And this expression of his is contrary to his own Narration, in Art. viii. [*infra.*] . . . You will think, sure, his proofs are strong: . . . true, he quotes many; and that I might see his bottom, I have surveyed all the printed authors in every page quoted; and I solemnly profess it! that none of these particulars rehearsed as he hath laid them down, much less in them all, will any of them bear him out; and I desire the reader to try whether I blame him justly or not, by perusing the books. But, that you may see how soberly and cautiously his quoted authors speak of churches using their liberty, I will write their own words: Ans. to 32 Q., p. 44, 'We conceive every church hath right from Christ, to transact all their church-business,' mark the cautions, 'if so they be able, and carry mat-

ters justly and according to the rules of the Word.' How different are those words from his : yet this is the very place he cites ! . . Dare you, [W. R.], pray for a 'blessing' on your book, as in the last words of your preface you do ; . . when it is so stuffed and bombasted with such fearful untruths and slanders ?" T. W. p. 36—39.

Art. iii. "All which things they claim to themselves power to do, without any authoritative concurrence or assistance of any other churches or their officers ; which they hold unlawful in others to offer and in themselves to accept or admit.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 41 ; R. M. to E. B. p. 10.

Rob. Justif. p. 335, 339."

"Authority is either immediately from the person,—and that, some call coercive and forcing,—or from the rule,—and that, some call doctrinal ; no less binding than the other.—The former, in transacting church-matters, we use not for want of Scripture grounds that Christ hath given any other churches, or their officers, power over us : the latter, upon all occasions we improve by calling in the assistance of other churches ; and hold ourselves bound to follow their counsel as far as it is grounded on the Word." T. W. p. 39.

Art. iv. "Therefore they ordinarily convene together,—before they have any officers,—and hold public ecclesiastical meetings, and execute all ecclesiastical duties and offices,—sacraments only excepted,—by mere laymen, that neither are nor, perhaps, ever shall be officers in the church.

Art. v. "This church, being thus invested with all church-power, deriveth part thereof upon her officers,—namely, so much as she cannot conveniently execute herself,—and the rest she keeps still in her own hands, and executes accordingly.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 57 ; R. M. to W. R. ; R. M. to E. B. p. 4.

Barr. Discov. p. 223.

Art. vi. "The officers have no power in church-matters but what the church deriveth on them, and which she may revoke and resume unto herself if she conceive they do not use it well.—*Ibid.* And, therefore, she may call them to account for their actions, though they were even apostles themselves.—J. Cott. on 5 Vials, p. 10."

" . . If great need require, they may admonish him [their officer] ; and if no other means will possibly cure, they may at last, for incorrigible going on in manifest abuse of his place, excommunicate him ; but in no wise, while he abides in office, to resume their power and enter upon his work. Observe him again, quoting his author . . who is not for him, but against him ! Ans. to 32 Q., p. 58, 'No member, without breach of order, and presuming above his place, may do our ministerial acts of church-government ; but the presbyters may only do them !' Which answer of ours doth also take off those marginals [against Arts. viii. ix.], . . and part of Art. vii. also, that speaks to the same effect." T. W. p. 39.

Art. vii. "The officers are all but the church's servants, in propriety of speech ; and she is the mistress, the queen. In all things she hath the power of decreeing, and they with her, as others the meanest members of the society : but as ministers, so they are only as her mouth to speak and her hand to act what she decrees ; doing all things for her, by her power and in her name.—*Ibid.* ; Mr. N. to W. R. ; R. M. to W. R.

Rob. Apol. p. 49. ; Rob. Justif. p. 121, 122, 138, 166, 178, 180, 185, 303, 322."

"That all officers are 'the church's servants,' was no strange thing to a minister far better than any of us, 'Ourselves your servants [δούλους] for Jesus' sake : ' 2 Cor. iv. 5. But . . he will in this, as almost in all

his Articles, be still adding something of his own to blur the business: therefore he saith, we 'hold' officers 'but the church's servants;' which word 'but,' implies a vilifying of ministers and their place. Whereas we have learned 'to esteem them very highly, for their work's sake;' 1 Thess. v. 13: and also, that they are 'only' servants; nothing 'but' servants! whereas we know that they are governors also. He adds another expression of his own, 'in propriety of speech,' and makes a great stir in his margin on that; .. whereas it is his own addition, and not our speech. The officer may be said to be a ruler and a servant too, in divers respects, as Heb. xiii. 17, with 2 Cor. iv. 5; and Christ himself is both; and so is the greatest prince in the world a 'servant' to the commonweal. But his [W. R.'s] spirit is loth to acknowledge this; and [he] labours to evade it by such arguments as the Bishops made use of for their sole power in the church; but we know, to be servants of the church, is no other than to be *for* the church; and not the church *for* them [rulers], equally... In this case, the maxim of law holds good in divinity, that a king is *singulis major, universis minor*; so the church-officers are *singulis majores, ecclesiâ minores*!" T. W. p. 39, 40.

Art. viii. "The acts which they ascribe unto the officers are such as these, namely, To declare, unto their people, the mind of God in any matter; to advise, counsel, exhort, reprove, etc.: To moderate in church-meetings that order may be observed, by propounding of things to be debated; gathering of voices; pronouncing the sentence accordingly: To execute all the church's decrees, in admission of members, ordination of ministers, admonition, excommunication, etc.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 57; Cott. Cat. p. 3, 10; Cott. on 5 Vials, p. 9, 10.

Rob. Justif. p. 9, 111, 114, 116, 121; Canne's Neces. of Sep. p. 135.

Art. ix. "Every member of the society, that is of years, except women, hath equal power with other,—even with the ministers themselves, as they conceive,—in propounding, debating, objecting, answering, and in judicially decreeing and giving sentence in all matters of the church, whether pertaining to faith or manners doctrine or practice whatsoever.—W. T. to P. H; Mr. W. Let. to a friend; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 44.

Bar. Refut. of Giff. p. 81; and in his Discov. p. 36, 38, 125, 223;

Rob. Justif. p. 9, 111, 121; Sion's Prerog. Roy. pref.

This body is all eye, and all tongue, no diversity of members, all governors, none to be governed: all teachers; contrary to the apostles' rule, 1 Cor. xii. 29. . . They complain in print, and otherwise, that ministers are slighted amongst them, yea, trampled upon by some; Cott. on Vial 2nd, p. 24; Mr. H. to S. A. They profess to condemn Morellian and popular government, but what can be more popular than this? .. At most they are but as the Speaker in the House of Parliament, or as a Moderator in a Synod; which rule not, but are rather ruled."

"The relator of a story,—especially when he pretends and promiseth to write nothing material but from his cited authors,—should be faithful, and not make bold grossly to vary from the matter, manner, words, scope, and all; much less to cite authors that speak against him! But if you read his author, Ans. to 32 Q., p. 44, the place cited even now, you will find that 'The church,' indeed, 'hath a right, within herself, to transact her own matters;' but how? 'according to the rights of the Word.' Did 'the Word' ever give people liberty equal with the ministers? Doth it not professedly condemn such doing in the church? And yet this is the only printed author of our own that we can come at, brought to justify this absurd Article. Besides, all men know, that are seen in our ways, it is against our principles to have people propound,

and give sentence in the church's decrees; these being acts of rule proper to the officers, as Ans. to 32 Q., p. 57, 58, plainly speaks. . . Now, what will become of his margin . . full of exclamation and clamour? 'This body,' saith he, 'is all eye, all tongue,' etc.; wherein he fights with a shadow; and we leave him so to do." T. W. p. 40.—"He mentions Cott. on Vial 2nd, p. 24, of whose words judge, and you shall not find one word to warrant him!" *Ibid.* p. 45.

Art. x. "And therefore, although the officers may lawfully prepare matters, in private, for the church's hearing; yet they hold, all things ought to have a full public debate in the presence of the whole society, that so they may be able to give their sentence in faith.—Apol. p. 31; J. C. printed Let. p. 4. Which is therefore usually done on the sabbath-day, after evening sermon.

Johns. Plea, p. 307; Rob. Apol. p. 38."

"Mark his words, how large; 'all things;' 'a full debate;' it 'ought' to be so before 'the whole society;' etc.: and not one word we can come at to prove these universals. Whereas the truth is, we neither 'hold' so nor practise so; . . rather labouring to take all things up in private, and then make as short work in public, when they must needs come there, as may be. . . Many of our churches are oft, for many days together, and weeks, and months also, free from such heaps of matters as he dreams of, and oftentimes from any at all. But this is his dealing, first he makes an Article of his own, . . and then draws his own collections from it." . . T. W. p. 40.

Art. xi. "Whether matters be carried amongst them by most voices or not, is not so generally agreed upon. Some affirm that the major part carries it against the lesser part; yea, though the officers be in this lesser part, and do show strong reason to the contrary.—Mr. M. to J. M. Others, that the whole body must agree, else nothing proceeds.—J. P. to W. R.; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 60, 61. Some, that things are not carried by voices at all, but by truth and right, and according to God.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 72; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 58, 60.

Barr. Discov. p. 78, 261; Johns. Plea, p. 307.

Sometimes they grant, indeed, all things are carried by consent of all; but then, they explain it thus, namely, That if it fall out that any lesser number do dissent, then the greater endeavour to give unto, or to receive from them, due satisfaction; which, if it be done, then all agree in one vote. If the lesser party dissenting, neither can give satisfaction to the greater, nor will receive satisfaction from them, but still persist in dissenting; then do the major part, after due forbearance, and calling in the counsel of some neighbouring churches, judicially admonish them; who, being thus under censure, their voice is now extinct and made void. And so, the rest proceed to vote; which vote is now the vote of all the church; namely, of all that have the power of voting therein.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 58, 61."

"In Art. xi. he deals exceedingly ill. . . He represents us to the world as a people unsettled and strangely divided amongst ourselves, in the way of voting. . . Our Narrator undertakes to relate the 'opinions and practices *generally* held' by the churches 'in New England,'—Head of Page 1,—and that the churches, in New England, walk in 'one way,'—Chap. I. Art. i;—and yet here he brings three relations crossing each other of our 'practices' in a very material point of Discipline! . . I confess, if he had undertaken to declare the 'practices' of *some* particular men only; . . or of *some* churches, not of *the* churches of New England in *general*; . . then his task were easier to show how they walk in three several ways at once. But now, I leave him to untie the knot, and save his credit. . . Here you see his speech verified in his 'Postscript,' p. 50,

that whether the reports he brings 'be true or false,' it 'is nothing' to him! Now we will scan his authors quoted, to see whether the blame lies on them or himself. The first pretended proof is Ans. to 32 Q., p. 60—62, that 'the whole body must agree, else nothing can be done:' whereas this author saith no such thing, but the contrary rather; that is, that 'if the whole body accord not at first, but the minor part disagreeeth, there are other means, partly within themselves and partly by calling in help from other churches, to bring matters to an issue.'... The second [pretended] proof, is for this, that some things 'are not carried by voices at all, but by truth and right, according to God;' and [he] cites Ans. to 32 Q., p. 58, 60: who saith to this effect, that 'The Word is the only rule whereby all church-votes are carried;' and that 'matters are not to be carried *only*,'—that is far enough from 'not at all!'—'by multitudes of voices.' For though 'the word of truth,' we all grant, be 'the only rule' of church proceedings, yet the means of all transactions, in our church, must be the lively voices of the saints, etc. Thus, his proofs failing, who must be the father of this untruth cast upon New England, you may well judge. Note yet further, whereas he quotes Ans. to 32 Q., p. 61, to prove that unless all 'agree' nothing can be done; yet from the same author and self-same page, in the end of this same Article, he concludes that though some disagree, yet matters may be ended, and 'the rest proceed.' As he often speaks contrary to himself, so he can make his author do the same, if he list; and can, as ships use to do at sea, sail contrary ways with the same wind! And yet, which is worse than the other, he would seem to hide... this dealing of his, and lay the fault upon our variableness, and say, 'Sometimes they grant, etc.'... yet all is from the same author, in the same page, at the same time. And often you will find this word 'sometimes,'... to make the world believe that our judgments and practices are variable; and to defend himself from a blow, in case he be questioned.

"If a 'lesser number,' saith he, 'dissent' from the 'greater, neither can give satisfaction to them, nor will receive it from them, and è contra; but still persist in dissenting, then the major part, after due forbearance, etc., admonish; and censure them.' This, he saith in the margent, is 'harsh' dealing, and 'uncharitable,' and 'foolish,' yea 'destructive;' and [he] spares no words that might lay load upon us... But he cites only Ans. to 32 Q., p. 58, 61; whose words are, 'If it appears that such as dissent from the major part be *factionously* or *partially* carried;' and, 'after the rest have laboured to convince them by the rule, yet still they continue *obstinate*, they are admonished, etc.' Now speak, W. R., is this fair dealing, first, to pretend proofs, and leave out the most material words; and, secondly, blame us for harshness when there is no cause? Here, you see, faction; partiality; both those, appearing; obstinacy; continuing in obstinacy, after means used according to rule; all these, before the censure of admonition passed! but you, in your relation, leave out all these words of your author's, and put in such of your own as will not so much enforce a censure as these; and then tax us, at your pleasure, and make bitter invectives against us in your margent... We have learned what the apostle saith, 1 Pet. ii. 23, and, to forbear." T. W. p. 41—43.

Art. xii. "Notwithstanding all this power aforesaid, by them attributed to this church when it is yet young, of very small number, and without officers too; yet do they deny unto it,—though grown never so numerous, and well furnished with godly and learned officers, and withal strengthened with the consent of other churches, and the Christian magistrate's authority,—all power to make any particular rules, or laws in things indifferent,—conducting to the better government, of herself, and more orderly and more edifying performance of God's worship and use of His ordinances,—according to the general rules of Scripture in such cases provided.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 66; Cott. Cat. p. 9; R. M. to E. B. p. 9.

Barr. Discov. p. 84, 255; Rob. Apol. p. 73."

"He hath falsified his printed authors, alleged for this Article, Ans., and Cott., where is not a syllable of things 'Indifferent;' for whereas they indeed deny churches' power to make laws about church-government, etc.; their words and meaning are expressed [that] it is only in such matters where the Scripture hath made laws already; and therefore they say, 'The churches have no power to make laws; but to observe those laws which Christ hath given and commanded:' and do allege Matt. xxviii. 20; Deut. xxxiii. 3; John xx. 27. None, I hope, can think this a thing 'indifferent,' for us to add laws to Christ's own laws; and this is all they say. If you mean by making of 'laws,' inferring of plain and necessary conclusions from their proper grounds in Scripture; we grant a power in a church so to do: yet so as they shall not be binding, unless the evidence of the consequence be made appear, as Rom. xiv. 5, 22, 23. But, if by making of 'laws,' you mean a drawing of conclusions from remote principles,—such as the Bishops were wont to do, 'All things must be decently done, and in order,' 1 Cor. xiv. 40, therefore a surplice, a cross in baptism, a bowing at the altar, etc.! we deny it, as an inlet of all human inventions," T. W. p. 43, 44. —"There are sundry unsound and uncouth passages in this chapter, .. which, for brevity, I am forced to pass by. .. I intreat thee [reader], to take all his sayings with a grain of salt; knowing from what spirit they proceed." *Ibid.* p. 45.

Chap. VII. Art. i. "All men are bound, say they, to become settled members of such a particular church,—as is before described:—and whosoever doth not, if possibly he can, sinneth. And whether he can or not, yet he remains, for the time, 'without' the visible church of Christ,—for which, they frequently allege 1 Cor. v. 12;—and in that estate, incapable of any church ordinance or privilege; though he be not only baptized but also truly converted, yea eminent in the profession of faith and practice of holiness, even unto martyrdom itself.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 11, 30, 38; D. against P., p. 4; R. M. to E. B., p. 6. Nay, he is accounted as one that despiseth church-fellowship, and unworthy of it; yea, wicked and profane.—Apol. p. 25—27, 34; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 69, 62; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 11, 12, 21; J. W. Ans. to 10 Quest.

Rob. Justif. p. 56, 71, 85, 86."

"In this Article, there are three things that will be found too light. First, He affirms we say 'All men are bound to be settled members, etc.;' yet in his margent he affirms we 'allow some to be admitted transient members, for a time only,' Apol. p. 20, 27. .. He must grant either a contradiction in his own words or prove one in our practice. Secondly, He affirms we say, that 'whosoever' is not a member of such a church 'as is before described,' that is, a New England church, is, 'for the time, without the visible church, etc.;' and quotes Ans. to 32 Q., p. 11. The author is abused, for he saith .. that 'If men be not members of some particular church or other, they may, in some respect, be

said to be without the power and privileges of the visible church.'... See how, against our expressed judgments, plain words, and the mind of his authors, he would make us odious, by laying such a gross tenet to our charge! Thirdly, That whosoever do not become settled members of our churches, are accounted despisers, etc., 'yea, wicked and profane.' He again rolls the same unhappy stone he did... chap. iii. art. xii. But you will say, sure, his proofs are strong!... therefore I entreat the reader but to review his proofs, which I will relate *verbatim*. Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62, ... saith thus, 'We maintain communion with all godly persons, though they be not in church-fellowship with us:' and, *idem*, p. 69, 'To be without church-fellowship, is the case of some believers.' And Ans. to 32 Q., p. 11, ... 'Some Christians, that are not without Christ, yet are not within any particular church!' These are the authors and pages he brings to prove the clean contrary. ... He hath an expression ... exceedingly gross, ... that 'whosoever doth not, etc. sinneth!' and, mark, 'whether he can or not, ... he is accounted ... profane and wicked!' He would make us up for the most absurd men that ever lived: ... but the blemish will and must needs fall upon himself." T.W. p. 45, 46.

Art. ii. "Persons admitted, are either infants or such as are of age.

Art. iii. When any person is of age to be admitted, he is first to desire and seek it in this or that particular church: and therefore, to make his desire known to the church by some of the Elders or members of the same.—R. M. to W. R.; J. M. to R. M.; J. W. to T. S.; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 8.

Art. iv. "Which said Elders, or others, do first privately examine him touching his knowledge in the doctrine of faith, and the truth of his conversion; as is before showed.—H. W. to Mr. B.; J. W. to T. S.; E. C. to R. C.; J. M. to R. M.; Apol. p. 3, 4.

Art. v. "If the examiners, upon this trial, conceive him not fit to enter into church-fellowship, then he is there stayed, without any further proceeding.—J. M. to R. M."

"He should have added, 'only for the present,' else ... such a person is 'stayed' from church-fellowship for ever; which himself knows to be untrue: [comp.] Art. vii., *infra*." T. W. p. 47.

Art. vi. "If they find him fit,—according to the fitness mentioned, chap. iii.—then they propound the man and his motion to the church; who are then desired to inquire further of [concerning] him, for their better satisfaction. And if any of them do or shall, by such inquiry, know anything justly to hinder his admission, to declare it, before he be admitted.—J. W. to T. S.; E. C. to R. C.

Art. vii. "After this, a day is appointed,—usually on the Sabbath,—and, when other public worship is ended, the said party is called forth and there makes public profession of his faith, and declareth the manner of his conversion: which, by such as can, is done in a continued speech of their own; by others, not so well able, in making answers to questions propounded to them concerning the same.—Apol. p. 3, 4. Wherewith, if any of the company be not satisfied, his admission is stayed for the time, till all things be cleared, and all objections answered. And then, by consent of the church, he enters into church-covenant with them; and so is admitted in the same manner as the rest were at the first constitution of the church.—R. M. to W. R.; H. W. to Mr. B.; E. C. to R. C.; J. M. to R. M.; J. W. to T. S.

If the party be a woman, or otherwise weak in expression; some tell us, that the body of the church meets more privately. ... E. C. to R. C. But if *all* the church meet then, how is it more private? If but *some* only, how shall the rest, by their tenet, judicially consent? Delegation, or representation, they will, by no means, allow ... Sometimes, they say, their confessions are taken privately by the examiners, and by them only related ... to the church: ... as Mr. H. to S. A. intimates. But how doth this agree with ... 'Do nothing partially,' 1 Tim. v. 21? ..."

“Is not this contradictory [not in agreement] to what he said, chap. iii. art. vi.? Now, to press *all* to make their declaration before *the whole* assembly; and yet to accept [allow] of some weaker ones doing it ‘more privately,’—which, indeed, is the truth,—are a contradiction!... The church knows, [‘judicially,’] by the testimony of such godly men whom they betrust:... who... making report,... the church proceeds to admit them [whom the messengers or delegates have tried]. ‘Partiality’ is, to respect the person, not the cause: here, the cause is respected, not the person; or the person, for the cause. Some, being more weak and fearful, we rather *tender*, as Jacob would not ‘overdrive,’ the feebler sort. [Gen. xxxiii. 13].” T. W. p. 47, 48.

Art. viii. “After the party is so admitted, the minister, or some one or more of the members of that church, in name of the rest, do give him the right hand of fellowship; and do, likewise, repromise to perform all church-duties to him, contained in the same covenant, as unto the rest of her members.—J. W. to T. S.

Art. ix. “Thus, for admission of persons of age: now, for Infants, they account them in the same estate with their next parents; for if either of their next natural parents be now,—or, being deceased, died—a member of some such particular society, as aforesaid, then are the children also accounted members, and so baptized, if they were not baptized before. Bnt if neither of them have been,—or having been formerly, if at the present, being alive, neither of them be a member; then, their infants,—as themselves,—are accounted to be ‘without’ the visible church: in the same estate with the children of Turks and heathen, ‘aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,’ Eph. ii. 12, and so incapable of baptism, or any other church-privilege whatsoever. Yea, though the grandfather be a member, or perhaps a minister of that church; or though one or more of the next parents, being no members, be eminently and famously godly, and will undertake to educate their children in the true faith and fear of God; and neither wilfully nor negligently omit to join themselves to such a church, but abstain only out of want of fit opportunity to do it, or out of tenderness of conscience, as scrupling some things in their way; yet, for all this, their Infants shall not be admitted to baptism, as not being within, but without the church.—Mr. M. Ans. to 9 Pos. 61—63, etc.; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 20, 21; Apol. p. 29.

Cold comfort to christian parents, not being of their way; and cold charity to their infants!”

“It were ‘cold comfort’ indeed! if that he said were true: but, blessed be God, it is not so. For, though such infants be not as yet members of this or that particular church there; yet he knows we account them and their parents members of ‘the visible’ churches of England: witness our writings in point, ‘Disc. of Cov. p. 36, etc.’ Therefore he much forgets himself... To say we esteem them as ‘children of Turks, etc.,’ is a most uncharitable and groundless censure; unworthy of his pen or our practice; to which we answered before. The Lord forgive him such hard speeches. For his quotations, ‘Ans. to 32 Q., p. 20, 21; and Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 61, 62,’ if they will afford him the least word or show for either of these particulars, I will take the blame for ever; let any please to peruse them! But he forgets the law in Israel, of amercing and striping the man that brings an ill report upon a virgin of Israel, [Deut. xxii. 18, 19]: I must mind him of it.” T. W. p. 48.

Chap. VIII. Art. i. “No person once thus admitted, as aforesaid, into any of their churches, ought to remove thence, without the consent of the said church first sought and obtained. For, if he do, they hold that he breaks covenant with God, and the church; and, like Ananias and Sapphira, lies against the Holy Ghost.—

Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 73; Apol. p. 39; R. M. to E. B. p. 6. Inasmuch as they conceive their covenant binds them, not to depart without consent. *Ibid.*

Art. ii. "Therefore, when any would remove, they require that he first give notice thereof to the church wherewith he is in covenant; and lay before them,—how many soever they be,—in a public meeting, both his reasons for which he desires to remove and also to what other church he would remove, and consult with them about both.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 74; Apol. p. 20.

Why must he needs consult with this, rather than any other? Perhaps this may be more partial, . . . because concerned more . . . Why with the whole church? . . . What if his reasons be secret, and he cannot discover them but to his shame, loss, or danger!"

"... Shall this engagement, so solemn, so sacred, so deliberate, be loosed at pleasure?... Shall a man infringe this covenant, deprive the church of her proper right, and lay her under blame of 'partiality' upon a mere supposal? Let 'this' church be first consulted withal, 'rather than any other:' and good reason too, for the covenant is made with her; and if it appear she is indeed 'partial,' then let the counsel of other churches and ministers be called in; which was never yet denied any member, and I hope never will be. The covenant being made with the whole, reason speaks the whole ought to untie the knot. But if there be some case extraordinary, . . . let the party but intimate so much to the church, and desire that some two or three faithful men be intrusted: and what hinders?" T. W. p. 48, 49.

Art. iii. "If, upon examination, they approve both of his reasons why, and of the place whither he would go, then they consent; and giving him Letters of dismission and recommendation to that other church, they send him away with their prayers and blessing.—*Ibid.*

Art. iv. "If contrarily, they approve not, either the one or the other, they dissuade him from his purpose: if they prevail not, they will not hold him by violence,—for that they cannot,—yet they will neither give their consent nor give him their Letters of recommendation,—though he were otherwise never so well deserving,—nor send him away with their benediction as otherwise they would.—*Ibid.* Yea, he shall depart little better than an excommunicate; as a covenant-breaker with God and man; and as one that is wise in his own conceit, and refuseth to hearken to counsel.—*Ibid.*

If this be so, as the Disciples said of marriage, It is not good to touch this covenant! . . . If he 'depart without consent, he goes . . . tacitly accused, slandered; not only not blest, but virtually cast out and curst: . . . there being, as it seems, a tacit agreement amongst them to receive no members from one church to another, unless they bring with them Letters, etc. . . I cannot but pity the good people of this kingdom, especially of this city [London], if the New England discipline and government should take place,—as many of them do desire;—for how will they endure to be so tied, who have [been], so long time, accustomed to keep with no society, but to pick and choose, now one and then another, every Sabbath almost, a new ministry and a new church; yea, tenaciously hold it as a maxim that 'They will be bound to none;' that, 'They may lawfully go where they like best, and where they can profit most.' "

"... If any man be desirous and steadfastly bent to depart, the church never holds him against his will, though she sees little or no weight in his reasons; and I hope it is not the case of 'marriage,' so easily to be dissolved. . . . What would he have them do, when they cannot be satisfied with the grounds of his departure? Must they needs act against light and conscience; and say they are satisfied, when they are not? Especially when they see a brother, haply, running into evil or danger by such a removal! All they can do is, through indulgence, to suspend their vote, and leave him to his own liberty. And yet they will neither

accuse nor *slander* him; much less *curse* him, or *cast him out!* These are words fit for nothing but retractation and repentance. . . To my best remembrance, I never heard of or knew any godly church-member that repented of this church-way, and desired, upon that ground, to make a retreat. . . I have read of Harpia, in Seneca, who still complained of the roughness of the way that made her limp, but saw not her own lameness to be the cause! I will not stand to make application; but unloose his knot, by telling him, Though a church cannot see cause enough to commend such a person as we speak of to another church, for [on account of] his departure from them, as being not clear in it themselves; yet, he being a godly man and of a good conversation in the general, they may and do use to commend him for his godliness, etc., and in prudence conceal any supposed error or infirmity in his departure from them: and upon such a testimony, he is received; and so need not be left 'as a heathen.' " T. W. p. 49, 50.

Chap. IX. Art. i. "They solicitously distinguish between church-communion and christian or religious communion. This latter, they hold generally with all whom they conceive to be true Christians, without reference to their church-estate, and whether they be in church-estate or not: therefore, they will confer, pray with them, etc. But the former, they hold only with such as they acknowledge to be true churches, and with their church-members.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62, 63; Apol. p. 28, 34.

Robinson hath a distinction not much unlike, of private and public communion; that, he allows with all Christians; this only with church-members.

Concerning which, see his whole treatise. [*Supra*, vol. i. p. 256]

Art. ii. "They call that church-communion which is only in such duties, privileges and ordinances, as are proper to such a particular society, and belong to none other; as, Admission of members into their society; Mutual watchfulness of each member over other; Admonition, in way to censure; Excommunication; Re-acceptance into society again, upon repentance; Administration, and receiving, of the seals; Vocation of ministers and all other officers, and deposing of them again.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 63; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 7; Apol. p. 27—29.

Art. iii. "As for preaching, reading and hearing the Word, catechising, praying, singing of Psalms, blessing the people, etc., though performed by church-officers and members only, and in the church assembly only, yet, in these, they hold there is no church-communion at all.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 7, 28; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62; Apol. p. 26, 34.

Rob. Justif. p. 192, 195.

Here we may see, how much and how long we have been mistaken: for when our Brethren of that way do so frequently,—perhaps fixedly,—preach and pray with us, not only privately in houses, but in our public assemblies also, we—fools!—think all this while, they hold church-communion with us; and do, thereby, actually own our ministry and church-estate as true! But alas, there is no such matter! It is but Christian-communion, at the best. Neither do they at all, preach unto us or pray with us, as ministers *ex officio*; much less, as our ministers: no! they will not confess themselves to be so much as members of our churches; but *ex dono*, only as men well gifted, and so able to edify the church by their gifts as mere private men, *ex communi officio charitatis*, as any man else may do that hath gifts to speak to the church's edification. . .

Art. iv. "These things, say they, do not only belong to church-communion, but to the communion of this particular church only of which one is stated a member; and therefore, are to be performed only to the members thereof, and not to the members of other churches, much less to any such as are not at all in church-estate.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 11.

Art. v. "Especially sacraments are to be administered,—as only by ministers of the same churches as after so,—only to church-members, and members of the same church.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62—64, 66, 70; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 11, 12, 37; Apol. p. 29, 30, 39—41; Cott. Cat. p. 6, 7; R. M. to E. B. p. 4—6; R. M. to W. R."

"The first thing meets us is a contradiction; for here, he saith in plain terms, that we in New England 'conceive' men may be 'true Christians,' whether they be 'in church-estate or not:' but, chap. vii. art. i., he affirmed absolutely, that whosoever is not a 'settled' member of 'a particular church' is accounted, by us, profane and wicked. . . . He saith again, arts. iv. v.; that we say that the 'sacraments, etc.' . . . do belong 'only' to the members of the same church: he speaks flatly contrary to this, chap. x. art. i., in these words, 'We [they] grant that [the] several churches have a communion amongst themselves, etc.:' . . . and both of them within a leaf, one of the other, in his book. W. R. himself must, of necessity, grant . . . a manifest contradiction, by himself, in a main point of his story: or, that his authors or intelligencers have written or spoken contrary concerning our way; and so, a man would think he hath little ground, in conscience, to build his 'Narration' upon their testimony: or, that [he] hath abused them, at his pleasure, and warped their words. . . . Furthermore, I here confidently avouch, and shall make it good, that those printed writers by him cited, are all consistent with themselves in this point of administration of sacraments to members of other churches; and not one of them crossing another or himself. Therefore, I must again,—but with grief of heart, to lay such load on a Brother,—lay this dealing upon him. . . . Nay, I will say more: If I cannot prove, plainly, that these authors cited, do not only not justify him, but write point-blank against him, I will bear the blame: *Vide* Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62, 'We do not,' say they, 'appropriate the seals only to members of our own church, excluding all other churches of Christ:' and Cott. Cat. p. 7, 'The supper,' saith he, 'is dispensed to the faithful of the same body, or recommended to them by a like body:' and Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 78, in these words, 'The members of other churches do mutually communicate at each other's churches, even as often as God's Providence leads them, and they desire it.' Lastly; If all this, be not enough to open his abusing us and the truth, I will go further to show you that he still cites the very same author to prove both parts of this contradiction: . . . for, in chap. ix. art. i., he cites 'Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62,' to prove we hold communion with other churches and their members; and also, chap. x. art. i., he cites the same author and page, for one church's communion with another, in the sacraments: but here, in art. v., when he would prove the contrary, . . . he brings the self-same author and page for that end! And thus, . . . in like manner, 'Ans. to 32 Q.; Apol.; R. M. to E. B. must all come in to avouch both parts of his contradiction: the one, in chap. x. art. i., for communion; the other, in arts. iv., v., of this 9th chap., against communion. . . . and yet these authors give him no occasion thereto, but speak all the self-same thing plainly and constantly, without variation." T.W. p. 50—52.

Art. vi. "They hold that if any sin be committed by any in the church for want of watchfulness and admonition in others, all the body is defiled therewith and made liable to a common judgment, as was all Israel by Achan's sin.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 50; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 75; Disc. of Cov. p. 7; Apol. p. 10.

Art. vii. "That a man that is *sui juris* may not, lawfully, stand member of such a church in which he cannot observe and enjoy all God's ordinances; nor where any corruption in God's worship, or other sin, is suffered unreformed: but if he be

joined to it, he must separate from it, else he is defiled therewith.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 32, 33.

Rob. Justif. p. 15, 16, 197, 200, 201; Johns. Plea, p. 245. Barr. Discov. p. 26, 29, 34, 38."

"The Narrator knows in his own conscience, that this is not spoken, by his cited author, of our churches in New England, but of the parish churches in Old England: nor of all the churches in Old England, but of such only where a man either cannot enjoy some ordinances of God, or else live there without sinful conformity; for this was written by his author in the time of the Bishops' reign. He alters the author's words and meaning, and that grossly: . . . his author saith, 'In such parish assemblies where a man shall and must himself 'conform to those corruptions, there his standing is unlawful.' Ans. to 32 Q., p. 32. So he leaves out the very nerves and strength of the place which is the ground of our both withdrawing; that is, a necessity of sinning." T. W. p. 52.

Art. viii. "Especially where any set Liturgy, or set form of prayer is imposed to be used.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 52, 59—61; Mr. M. to J. M.; Cott. Cat. p. 5, 6; R. M. to E. B. p. 7.

Johns. Plea, p. 245, 285; Brown[ist] Confess. [1596.] Art. xlv.; Canne's Necess. of Sep. p. 110; Rob. Justif. p. 344.

..Whereas they dislike set forms, because 'imposed:' I cannot see how bare imposition, by lawful authority, of that which is lawful,—so far only, as it is lawful,—should make it unlawful; I should rather think it should make it necessary. . ."

"This is the fourth time he hath harped on this string. . . If God had not pitifully left him to himself, in this Narration, I am confident he would not have come thus far, . . . that, if we, in New England, 'allow set forms of psalms;' and of 'blessings of the people;' and forms of 'church-covenants,' and of 'catechising;' etc.: why not as well 'set forms of prayers imposed?' . . . I leave him to the Father of truth, to show him his error." T. W. p. 52.

Art. ix. "And where bad men are suffered to come to the sacraments with the good; because thereby both the ordinances, and all that partake in them, are defiled.—Apol. p. 37; J. D. to L. H.

Barr. Discov. p. 34; Rob. Justif. p. 15, 197, 201, 204.

Chap. X. Art. i. "They grant that several churches have a communion amongst themselves, whereby they do and may mutually partake, each with other, in some church-ordinances; as, sacraments. And, that this communion is both between the ministers and members of the same.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 62, 78; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 29; Apol. p. 2, 13; R. M. to E. B. p. 11."

"He saith, and that truly, We 'grant, etc.' Of the contradiction between this and chap. ix, arts. iv. v., it is spoken to already, [p. 326]. . . Note how thick his sayings and unsayings fall. In chap. ix. art. i., he affirms 'we hold' communion with other 'churches and church-members;' and then, presently, in arts. iv. v., he expressly denies that we hold any such 'communion.' Then again, in the very next chapter, x. art. i., he saith as full as can be, that we hold communion 'mutually, etc.;' and, by-and-bye, in chap. xii. art. viii., as fully and expressly denies again, that we hold any such thing! The man being an able and judicious man in other things, it is more remarkable he should be thus extremely left to confound himself, while he sought to confound our poor innocent churches." . . . T. W. p. 53.

Art. ii. "By virtue of this church-communion, they say, one church, by Letters of recommendation, may give power to another church over any of her members for excommunication; and the ministers of one church may convey power to the ministers of another church for administration of the sacraments to any of their members.—Cott. Cat. p. 7; Apol. p. 2, 14, 26, 40; J. W. to T. S. Hence the infants of some of Windsor-church, in New England, have been baptized by the ministers of the church of Dorchester there.—R. M. to W. R."

"He reports that one church 'may give power to another, etc.;' that 'the ministers of one church may, etc.' Neither of which do we hold or practise! The only author cited, that we can come at, is Cotton, whose words are these, 'The supper is dispensed by the minister to the faithful of the same church; or to such as are commended to them by a like body:' See, if here be one tittle to bear him out!" T. W. p. 53.

Art. iii. "But without such Letters of recommendations, and formal granting over of such power from one church and minister to another, it were unlawful in any case to administer any church-ordinance to any church or members but their own, or to admit them to any church-communion upon any pretence whatsoever.—Apol. p. 14, 26, 40."

"Here is neither truth nor proof to be seen. 'Letters, etc.' for public participation, are not sent from one minister to another, but from a church to a church. We hold it not 'unlawful,' but do often practise, to receive other members to communion with us without 'Letters;' especially if they be known to any of our church; else, such 'Letters' are desirable. But he saith, we do not 'in any case;' 'upon any pretence whatsoever:' which is utterly false." T. W. p. 53, 54.

Art. iv. "Though they hold it lawful, by this communion of churches, for one church to admit the members of another unto fellowship of church-ordinances and privileges, yet not of every church: but they think themselves bound to know the church well,—whose members they so admit, as well as the members themselves,—whether it be a true church or a false, a pure church or a corrupt.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 29.

Art. v. "And that if they should admit any members of a false church, they should offend in so holding communion with a false church: yea, if they should admit any members of a corrupt church, they should be defiled by such communion; unless they did first protest against their corruptions.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 29; J. C. printed Letter, p. 12. Yet they hold no such defilement by admitting them into religious communion, though their church were not only impure but utterly false.

Art. vi. "They are very strait-laced in denying communion to the members of other churches that are not constituted and governed in the same manner with their own; which only, they conceive to be constituted and governed according to 'the rule of Christ.'—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 82—84. Yea, if a company of approved godly people should sit down near them,—where their power reacheth,—differing from them only in some points of church-government, some of them tell us, That not only they should not be owned as a sister-church, but should also be in danger of severe punishment by the civil magistrate.—H. W. to P. H."

"If you weigh well this accusation of us in all the particulars, it is very harsh and sore; and here is no proof but H. W. Who this should be, I profess I cannot tell; unless some malignant, or back-friend, amongst us there; or, whether such a thing were ever written in these words and sense, I know not. And if it be certainly so written, and from a godly man, yet it is but one single witness; and I am forbidden, and so are all others, 1 Tim. v. 19, to receive 'an accusation' against one 'Elder'—much more against all the elders and churches in New England,—without 'two or three witnesses:' therefore we dare not be-

lieve it. To this very point in hand, the 'Ans. to 32 Q., p. 82, 83,' speaks fully and fairly; which W. R. well knowing,—for it was written to himself, amongst others,—deals not candidly to conceal that Answer of a printed book from known authors of credit in New England, because it is fair and loving,—for what other ground could he have?—and bring in the answer of H. W.—a man we know not,—which is harsh and distasteful." T. W. p. 54.

Chap. XI. Art. i. "I hear, some of them, have pressed that, not only the scandalous, but also, the non-proficients that grow not in grace under the means, might be excommunicated. Which was the ground, as some of them report, of a groundless course set on foot amongst them at Cambridge in New England, that the people met together privately, at certain times, weekly or fortnightly, each one to hold forth unto the rest, the work of God upon his or her soul, from their first conversion unto that present day; that so, their pastor might know how they grew in grace.—A. W. to Mr. B."

"With what face can any godly man call such a meeting of the saints for such a holy end... 'a groundless' meeting!... No marvel he calls his book a 'poor pamphlet':... it will appear yet poorer, before we have done, to any candid reader."... T. W. p. 54.

Chap. XII. Art. i. "When a church, by admission of more members, is now grown to a competent number,—which oftentimes proves some years first,—then they address themselves to the calling of some to the ministry and other offices in the church.—R. M. to W. R."

"... Why he should so double and treble the very same things, totidem verbis, I know not; unless, haply, to make a deeper impression of his own mistakes in his reader! It is our usual and constant course, as hath been said, not to gather any church until they have one amongst themselves fit for a minister; whom with all speed they call into office, and account themselves a lame and imperfect body till that be effected. In his margin, he saith he is told to his 'comfort,' that 'many that were counted good ministers in Old England,' are there laid aside, because they aim at men of 'special' parts! We desire proof for this aspersion... And whereas he saith he was told so;... let him produce his authors..." T. W. p. 55.

Art. ii. "If any of their own members be fit for the service, they make choice of them; if not, they procure elsewhere: yet so, that none is chosen to be an officer in any church till he be first formally admitted member of the same church, in the same manner, every way, as others have been.—W. W. to Mr. B."

Art. iii. "The several churches with them,—how small soever, and though as yet without any officers,—do challenge to themselves both power and execution of all things whatsoever do belong to the calling and creating of their own officers; as, To examine and try their abilities and fitness; To elect them; To instruct them in their office, at their ordination; To ordain them with imposition of hands, prayers, and charges given them; And, in sum, to give them all the power of their office in that church, in the Name of Christ.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 40—42, 68, 71; Disc. of Cov. p. 23; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 70, 77; R. M. to W. R.; H. W. to Mr. B."

Rob. Justif. p. 300, 303; Canne's Necess. of Sep. p. 29; Barr. Refut. of Giff. p. 130; A light for the Ign. p. 7; Rob. Apol."

"... Is it not a thing most natural for a body to employ its own members? Is not the mutual interest, in each other, the stronger tie? Do not all bodies and societies in the world, the very same? Was ever any man of another corporation elected sheriff or mayor, or unto any special office in London, unless he were first seasoned with this same

‘salt,’ as he saith [in the margin] of ‘membership’ of the same body?” T. W. p. 55.

Art. iv. “Whereby it is come to pass that every of their first ministers at least, in every of their churches, is ordained by one or more private men appointed by the rest, in their names, to pray over them, impose hands upon them, instruct, charge them, and give them authority there to minister. The act being the act of the whole church; but, for order and ease sake, the formality is committed to one or two in name of the rest, as the Israelites laid ‘hands upon the Levites,’ Num. viii. 10.—J. M. to R. M.; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 68—70; R. M. to E. B. p. 10.

Rob. Justif. p. 328, 331, 338.”

“.. Though the Levites were church-officers, and the children of Israel were not, yet the children of Israel did lay their hands upon the Levites: and, though all the children of Israel could not do this, yet some principal ones did it instead of the rest. So, it may be lawful, in some case, to do the like. If [the] people have a power of election of officers—which is the greater—then, why may they not ordain them—which is the less—unto the office which, before, they elected them to? But I refer the reader to see more of this, in Mr. Mather’s late Answer to Mr. Herle, p. 45.” T. W. p. 56.

Art. v. “They hold that the People’s election is not only essential unto, but also the whole substance of the calling of the minister or other officer. But as for ordination with imposition of hands of the presbytery, or other sign, they hold it not essential at all, but a mere formality or solemnity of the calling: the presence whereof, addeth nothing to the substance of the calling; and the absence thereof, takes nothing from it.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 67—69; Disc. of Cov. p. 23; R. M. to E. B. p. 10; Apol. p. 24.

Rob. Justif. p. 308, 332—335; Rob. Apol. p. Per electionem jus ministerii Presbyteris confertur, etc.; Barr. Refut. of Giff. p. 219. 130.”

“Doth he judge all the churches and ministers of Christ there, so devoid of religion, reason, or the light of common sense, as to account a venerable ordinance of God ‘a mere formality?’ But that you may see whether he deals well with us or not, *vide* ‘Ans. to 32 Q., p. 67,’ where it is expressly said, that ‘though the essence of a minister’s call consists in his election, yet we look at ordination by imposition of hands necessary by divine institution.’ Can he, with any show of reason, explicate a thing ‘necessary by divine institution,’ by ‘a mere formality?’ Is this right commenting upon the text?.. For the other printed proof, ‘Disc. of Cov. p. 23,’.. there is not the least show for such an expression, .. but only that ‘People have power to choose their own officers.’.. It is his call, not his wages, makes a pastor or no pastor.” T. W. p. 56, 57.

Art. vi. “After the first officers are thus made by the church, the formality of ordaining the rest is, ordinarily, committed to such officers as are already called and ordained; not as having any more power, by virtue of their office, to do it, than before, for the power is the church’s, and belongs equally to every member as a member; but, as being the churches’ public servants, to do it for them, and in their name and stead.—See the quotations [or references] cited, Art. iv.

Rob. Justif. p. 321, 323, 327.

So that if they have but one pastor or teacher, he alone lays his hand on the next officer to be ordained. But St. Paul’s rule is .. the hands of the presbytery; not of one single presbyter, much less of one private man.”

“That ‘one pastor, etc.’ hath neither proof nor truth; but is against our judgments and practice.” T. W. p. 57.

Art. vii. "In the sorts or kinds of their officers, they agree with others of the best reformed churches. Only, whereas in opinion and tenet, they precisely distinguish between the pastor's and teacher's office; yet, in practice, they usually confound them; both pastor and teacher equally teaching and equally applying both the Word and seals, without any difference; and either of them usually supplying the place of both, in divers of their churches which are not furnished with both. See J. C.'s Sermons on Rev., and other texts, for proof of this: besides what we have by others' report."

"... In such congregations where there is but one, he labours to improve his talent both ways, for the present necessity. . . And for his proof, see how punctual he is! . . . Would he have us look over all Mr. Cotton's Sermons? . . . We turn him not to all, . . . but to one certain place in his Cat. p. 2, 'The pastor's special work is to attend upon exhortation; the teacher, on doctrine;' and his own, and others' practices there, run accordingly." T. W. p. 57.

Art. viii. "They hold, the officers, so called and made by this church, are officers, only in and unto this particular church that hath so called them; and bound only to minister to that and the members thereof, and to none other: so that the pastors and teachers thereof may, lawfully, do no ministerial act whatsoever in or unto any other church or the members thereof than their own.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 11, 15, 70; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 64, 67, 70, 76, 78; Apol. p. 14, 26, 29, 38.

Rob. Justif. p. 317, 318, 335."

"In the margin, he saith that 'some' of us do question 'the communion of churches,' as a thing overthrowing some of our principles: that 'others,' to uphold it, 'have invented a power' in one minister to translate his own power to another minister, 'to administer the seals and censures to any of their members.' These are ungrounded, unproved, expressions; and but repeated by him now; answered before by us. . . As for that inference he seems to draw, that every ministerial act, without 'power,' and irregularly done, seems 'void;' and so, 'millions' of persons unbaptized to this day; . . . that maxim in law, well approved of by divines in this case, *Quod fieri non debuit factum valet*, holds good here. I know no grounds that Zipporah had to have circumcised her son—Exod. iv. 25,—for it was proper to the man, Gen. xvii. 9, 23; yet being done, it was not void or null: and, though a priest, popishly affected, should baptize a child with many invented superstitions, the child is not looked on as unbaptized." T. W. p. 57.

Art. ix. "They grant, indeed, that ministers may preach unto, and pray with, other churches and their members, because these are, properly, no ministerial acts. Only the administration of the sacraments, with them, are properly ministerial; and therefore belong only to the ministers. All other acts, are common to other members, either by virtue of their gifts, and *ex communi officio charitatis*, or by the power of the Keys, which they have received in common with that church of which they are members, or by a temporary deputation from the same.—Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 78.

Rob. Justif. p. 195."

"'All other acts are common:' it is not true. We hold no such thing. The proof he brings no whit reacheth it. It is directly against his own authors he builds upon: 'Ans. to 32 Q., p. 57, The calling,' saith he, 'of assemblies, and dismissing them; preaching the Word, and prayer; administering the seals; permitting to speak in the assembly; enjoining silence; voting of matters; pronouncing of censures, etc.:

these are acts which the presbyters may do, and no other members.' It is contrary to himself, chap. vi. art. viii., where he sets down the several acts which he himself saith we ascribe unto our officers." T.W. p. 57, 58.

Art. x. "They hold that a minister's calling lives and dies with his union unto, and disuniting from, that particular church wherein and whereby he was so called, as before; so that, if a minister, lawfully chosen and ordained in one place, shall remove,—upon never so just and necessary grounds,—to another congregation, he is, thereby, divested of his former ministry, and now become as a mere private man again; unless and until he shall be called and so created again by the same, or some other, congregation; in which case, he is not only to be elected anew but also to be ordained anew by the imposition of the hands—perhaps, of some mere private man, or men,—as if he had never been ordained before. And so toties quoties.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 69, 70; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 67, 77; J. W. Ans. to 10 Quest.

Rob. Justif. p. 317."

"Whereas he is looked on and revered as a worthy instrument of Christ; a man of gifts and parts; one that hath honoured God in his House, and may do it again; and, in the mean time, is employed in dispensing his gifts, etc.; is this, to be as 'a mere private man?' But he is not able to speak, without disparaging." T.W. p. 58.

Art. xi. "They hold, the ministers are but the church's servants; her mouth, by whom she speaks, and hands, whereby she acts; and therefore, though they meet together to consult matters for the good of the churches, or to prepare matters for the churches' hearing, yet in point of government they can decree, act or execute nothing but what the church doth dictate and direct.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 57.

Rob. Apol. p. 49; Sion's Prerog. Roy. p. 26, 20.

Art. xii. "Ministers, they hold, are only ministers of churches already gathered; which are all supposed to be already real saints effectually called: so that the end and work of the office of ministers and their ministry is only the confirmation and building up of men already converted and inchurched! Nor are they bound, by virtue of their office, to attend unto the work of converting souls, any more than other gifted brethren are, who use it by the office of common charity.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 80, 82.

Rob. Justif. p. 308, 11, 47.

Whence, it must needs follow, that either none are converted in their churches, by their ministry; or else, if any be, that falls out only accidentally, not as the direct end of their office, and God's ordinance."

"He strangely forgets himself: for we say not that all our members are, certainly, 'real saints,' but only, visibly;... hypocrites,... [and] children of our members,... are not yet, haply, converted; and he is bound to fulfil his office towards them... To prove this Article, 'Ans. to 32 Q.' affords him not one tittle towards it; therefore I look upon this Article as a devised thing of his own... He draws many invective conclusions against us in a long margent, but... the ground sinking, the building falls: and thus he shoots at his own shadow. So, still he keeps his old custom: frames a false Article,... then pretends a proof;... then falls out with us for holding such absurdities; lastly, draws his inferences from his own premises: this is his dealing all along his book..." T.W. p. 58.

Art. xiii. "They acknowledge a most strict tie between the minister and his people; and that the one hath special *propriety* in the other.—Apol. p. 11, 24; R. M. to E. B. p. 11.

Art. xiv. "They conceive it unwarrantable, that ministers should have set and certain stipends or wages; much less that they should live upon tithes: but rather,

upon the people's voluntary contribution, weekly cast into the common treasury according to their weekly gains; out of which, the deacons are to distribute both unto the officers and poor, according to that which is brought in, and as they conceive to be fit and needful for every one.—R. M. to W. R.; Mr. B. to S. A.; J. W. to T. S.; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 77; Cott. Cat. p. 7, 8; R. M. to E. B. p. 7, 8.

Rob. Justif. p. 214, 353; Barr. Discov. p. 53, 61, 62; Brown. Confess. Arts. xx., xlv.

.. How comes it to pass, that some of them, amongst us, do not only receive but strictly require so much set stipend for such a Lecture, and so much more for such another, or else they will not preach; but also, can be content to take the glebe, tithes, and other profits of sequestered parsonages and vicarages amongst us as well as others? But, in some sort, I marvel not at it, if that be true, which we are credibly informed, that some of our Brethren of the ministry there, have not long since complained that their prophets did now prophesy in sack for want of maintenance.—M. B. to S. A. And others of them, out of their love, have warned us of the like danger, if tithes amongst us should go down—Mr. W. to Mr. M. And therefore, no marvel if our Brethren that have been bitten with the people's cold contributions there, be content to forsake that rule, and to covenant for wages, as we do here."

"Here are three particulars affirmed, and hardly any one of them true: for this 'weekly contribution' is properly intended for the poor, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 1; yet so as, if there be much given in, some churches do,—though others do not,—appoint the overplus *towards* the minister's maintenance. This is not given in by the people 'according to their weekly gains,' for that is an addition of his own, but 'as God hath blest them with an estate in the general;' for, suppose a member that is rich, though he hath not gained but lost the week last past, yet he contributes on the Lord's day following. Nor is this dispensed to the ministers, in those churches where any part of it is so given; though by the hands of the deacons, yet not, for proportion as they please, for this were to set the deacons above the pastor and teacher; but by the church, who usually, twice in the year, or oftener, do meet to consult and determine of the sum to be allowed for that year to their ministers, and to raise it either from the church's treasury,—so much of it as there is to be had,—only a contribution to be then made on purpose. And for one proof of all those, he brings 'Ans. to 32 Q., p. 77,' wherein is nothing to prove any one of those particulars mentioned, but some things rather against him; for there it is said that 'Our ministers' maintenance must be honourable, for his person, charge, and for hospitality; not as alms and courtesy, but as debt and duty: and to be paid according to rules of justice, etc. But, for a way of settled and stinted maintenance, there is nothing done that way,'—mark this!—'except from year to year.' Do but compare these words with his Narration! Now, upon these premises unsoundly laid, he builds .. in his margin... Then he falls upon some of us, in particular, whosoever they are, for 'strict' requiring of so much 'set stipend, etc.'.. I must here profess, .. as in the sight of God, for my part, I know not any one of us that doth so. But sure I am, I know some, of the contrary practice, who neither stand compounding at all, much less, 'strictly,' as he saith, 'require' so much and so much; least of all, refuse to 'preach' when such sums of the people's own voluntary proffering lie unperformed; but yet, notwithstanding, go on as painfully and constantly in their preaching to them, as before... His arrows are shot against a brazen wall: let him take heed lest, by a Divine hand, they rebound.".. T. W. p. 59, 60.

Art xv. "As this church hath power to make her own ministers, so also to question, censure, unmake and depose them; and by re-assuming their power, to reduce them into the state of mere private men again. And this also, they claim power to do, as well as the other, without any authoritative concurrence of any others whatsoever; whose counsel, although they may and, perhaps, will, crave and use yet that is done freely without any authoritative obligation in foro externo.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 41; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 77; J. C. printed Letter, p. 3.

Rob. Justif. p. 111, 176, 177; Sion's Prerog. Roy. p. 26: Separ. [atists' or Brownists'] Confess. Art. xxiii.; Canne's Necess. of Sep. p. 155."

"In the margent... he makes three several accusations, and that of three churches ['Mr. W., S. B., R. S., their cases'] without any one witness; therefore, till the true father appears, we must still lay the brat at his door." T. W. p. 60.

Chap. XIII. Art. i. "They hold it lawful for mere private persons,—that is, such as neither are in office, nor are ever likely to be,—to exercise their gifts in and before the whole congregation, in preaching, that is, expounding and applying the Scriptures to the several uses of the auditors, by instruction, confutation, reprehension, with all authority; yea, that this is an ordinary and perpetual ordinance in the church, grounded upon 1 Cor. xiv.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 78; Cott. Cat. p. 6; R. M. to E. B. p. 7. There is a book printed, called 'A Sermon, preached at Plymouth in New England,' which, as I am certified, was made there by 'a Comber of Wool.'

Rob. Justif. p. 183; Johns. Inq. p. 7; A Light for the Ignor. p. 19. Some of them, indeed, tell us that it [private men's preaching] is seldom used; namely, only where the church is unfurnished with officers, or in case of their absence or sickness.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 77.

... Some of them have their farms... so far off, from their settled congregations that they cannot possibly come every Sabbath:... and therefore must either preach one to another or else be utterly without.—I. P. Besides we are informed from thence, the people of late grow more violent in claiming... public prophesying; urging for it the writings and arguments of Mr. Robinson the 'Brownist.' sometimes, also,... deserting their own ministers and churches, *because they are not suffered to enjoy it* [!] M. B. to S. A."

"Of 'private men, prophesying,'... this is the fifth time of repeating it:... but the oftener he hath said his lesson, the worse he hath learned it:... First, W. R. saith this prophesying is done by 'mere' private men: his author, 'Ans. to 32 Q., p. 77, 78,' tells us, 'men haply indued with a gift of prophesy.' Secondly, he saith they preach for 'confutation;' as if they must be polemical men;... but not one word of that in the author. Thirdly, he saith they expound and apply the Word 'with all authority;' but no word sounding that way in the author! those words being properly applied by Paul to the officers, Tit. ii. 15, not to the prophets. Fourthly, he saith this prophesying is 'ordinary;' the author saith, 'They are not called to prophesying ordinarily,'—if by ordinary, he means frequently and usually,—'but sparingly and seldom; frequently, when the officers are sick, or absent, etc.' His other author cited is Mr. Cotton, 'Cat. p. 6;' and as in other quotations he added divers particulars of his own;... so, in this, as corruptly he leaves out many material things:... as, prophesy must 'be allowed for prophets;' 'not prophesy till the elders have done;' 'not unless the time permit;' 'and then also, they must be first called thereunto by the elders:' but W. R. hath not one word of all these, that so much serve to clear our practice... He would here cast a blur, by saying there is a book printed,... 'A Sermon,... by a Comber of Wool:' but I entreat the reader to put him to his proofs... He comes in with,

‘some of them tell us, etc.;’ .. as if we were at variance amongst ourselves... He saith in his margent, that ‘some’ of our people ‘have their farms so far off.. that they cannot possibly come every sabbath, etc.’ I should know New England as well as I. P., or M. B., or any of his informers; but I solemnly here profess, and with a safe conscience avouch it, that I know no truth in any of all these particulars asserted, but rather the contrary: unless, haply, in those of the Island [‘Aquid-nect, or Rhode Island;’ See Morse and Parish, Hist. of New England, p. 87, 88], or such as adhere to them; who, he knows well, are not of us; whose ways and spirits are as grievous to our churches as to himself. Why should he impute their practices to us, more than the opinions of the Antinomians and Familists, here in London, to the godly ministers and people of the city? ..” T. W. p. 61.

Art. ii. “Also, after their preaching, they take upon them to bless the people at their dismissal, as the ministers do.”

“I desire his grounds and proofs: .. that Answer to 32 Q., p. 38, .. expressly saith, that ‘blessing the people in the Name of the Lord, is an act .. which no member may presume to do.’ ”

Art. iii. “Likewise, they have a course, before their dismissal, to give leave to any that doubts of anything that hath been then, or formerly, delivered in public, by the minister or any other, publicly to propound their doubts and make their objections, and to argue, pro and con., about any matter good for edification.—W. T. to P. H.; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 78; Cott. Cat. p. 6.

Bar. Discov. p. 139; Johns. Inq. p. 7.

Methinks it is an abrupt course, at the first dash openly to implead the minister of error delivered before all the people. ..”

“If a better than himself, durst not reproach one worse than ourselves, though he had ground enough to have done it, I hope then W. R. dare not, without any ground at all, bring these sore accusations against so many churches. But what his proofs are you shall see. Mr. Cotton’s words are these, ‘It may be lawful for any, except women, to ask questions at the mouth of the prophets.’ Cat. p. 6. Mr. C. speaks only of asking ‘questions’ of ‘the prophets,’ that is, such members as prophesy; he [W. R.] adds, of the ‘ministers’ also. Mr. C. seems to speak of [with a reference to] the matter then delivered only; he [W. R.] adds, ‘formerly’ also. Mr. C. excepts ‘women;’ he [W. R.] saith leave is given ‘to any,’ without exception. Mr. C. speaks soberly; ‘it may be lawful;’ he [W. R.] speaks peremptorily, we ‘have a course, etc.’ Mr. C. allows only ‘to ask questions;’ but he [W. R.] adds,—a beadroll of his own, to make us odious,—they may object, ‘argue, pro and con., about any matter, etc.:’ yea, they do abruptly, ‘at the first dash, openly implead, etc.;’ so as it is a ‘scandal to the people,’ and a ‘reproach to the minister, etc.:’ all this is his own! Then for the other cited author, ‘Ans. to 32 Q., p. 78,’ he deals more grossly with him than the former; who is, in a manner, point-blank against him: .. his words are, ‘We never knew any minister that did call upon the people thus to do,—that is, to propound ‘questions,’—‘and such calling upon them is far from us. Some think the people have a liberty to ask a question .. upon very urgent and weighty cause. None judge the ordinary practice of it necessary; but, if not meekly and wisely carried, inconvenient, if not utterly unlawful; and, therefore, such ask-

ing of questions, is seldom used in any [church], in most churches never. True it is, in the times of the opinions, some were bold in this kind; but these men are, long since, gone. The Synod [query? at Cambridge, in New England] and sermons have reprov'd this disorder; so that a man may now live from one end of the year to another, in these congregations, and not hear any man opening his mouth in such kind of questions.' Now, good reader, do us the favour to give righteous judgment... See, what a vast gulf betwixt the author and W. R. !... What will not W. R. boldly attempt against his Brethren of the Independent way?..." T. W. p. 62, 63.

Chap. XIV. Art. i. "They grant that churches may, and ought to, consult and advise one with another in any doubtful matter incident; and ought to hearken to the good advice of one another. And therefore, they sometimes allow combinations of divers churches for consultation; but not imperative, or coercive.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 64—66.

Johns. Plea, p. 251.

Of late, some of them, grow shy of the word 'Independent.'—H. P., in his Epistle to the Reader. Some utterly renounce it.—Apol. Nar. p. 23. But yet it is generally owned by most, in the name;—R. M. to E. B. p. 9; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 46, 47, 64, 65;—by all, in the thing, as after.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 43, 44, 46.

They love no imperative Synods, or Presbyteries; but they have store of imperative churches. . . Why have not many churches united, as much power over every particular church within the union, as many members united have over every person amongst themselves?"

"If the word 'Independent' be rightly taken,—as in Ans. to 32 Q., p. 46, it is expounded—for one church, that is not under the power of another, or in subjection to a presbytery; but, as having received power from Christ to govern herself according to his laws: then, all accord to it. But if the word be abusively taken, as it is often, with the vulgar, for such a society as are neither subject to magistracy nor regard the counsel of other churches; but, are a conceited and self-sufficient people, that stand only on their own legs: then, we have cause to be 'shy' of a word that may render us odious without cause! That we 'have store of imperative churches, etc.' [is] another slander,—without ground, or proof, or truth,—which I leave here upon record... To persuade men to act without light, much more to 'command' or 'compel,' . . though the thing required were lawful, are odious in the churches of Christ..." T. W. p. 63, 64.

Art. ii. "But each particular congregational church is the supreme judicature, whose power is absolute, and imperial; and therefore, may, and ought to, transact all things within themselves, without seeking or submitting unto any authoritative concurrence of any other churches.—R. M. to W. R.; Cott. Cat. p. 12, 13; Ans. to 32 Q., p. 44, 62, 64—66; J. W. Ans. to 10 Quest.

Rob. Justif. p. 107, 112, 444; Johns. Plea, p. 70, 251;

Barr. Discov. p. 261."

"All we use to speak of our church-power is, that it is 'ministerial'; which is far from 'absolute, and imperial:' words fitter for emperors of this world, than [for] the churches of the saints... For his two printed authors cited,—for we cannot come at his private Letters,—if there be any one word, or show of ground from them, to maintain his speech, let me bear the shame of it; for I here avouch the contrary, under my hand." T. W., p. 64.

Art. iii. "Therefore, they hold it unlawful for any such combinations, whether in classes,—that is, compound presbyteries,—or synods, provincial, national, or others, to take upon them, authoritatively, to determine or decree anything in matter of doctrine or practice, as intending thereby to oblige any more, or others, than their own persons; no, not in foro externo: much less, to execute any censure at all upon any other, nor yet upon any of themselves present, though never so delinquent. All this, belonging only to particular congregational churches, as their proper right, Therefore, also, they deny all representation of churches absent; all authoritative deputation, or sending of messengers, to act for them; all appeals from the particular congregation to any higher judicature ecclesiastical.—*Ibid.*

Johns. Inq. p. 70.

Yet some tell us, that Mr. P. and Mr. W. were sent over hither, by the churches, to negotiate for them, here. . ."

"That we 'deny all representation of churches absent,' and 'all authoritative deputation of messengers, to act for them;' the reader may well see it is his own saying, not ours; for he brings no proof but from Barrowe and Johnson, who . . . were in their graves,—both or one,—long before ever we had a being in New England. . . And it is answered before, chap. ii. art. iii. . . What will you say now, W. R.; . . for neither did their own churches, nor all 'the churches,' send Mr. P. and Mr. W.; but the whole State of New England,—or General Court,—with one consent, upon some special employments which cannot yet be all finished? . . ." T. W. p. 64, 65.

Art. iv. "If any church, among them, do err or sin in any notorious sort, the rest agree together to call them to an account, to instruct, advise, reprove, admonish them, etc. If they prove obstinate and obey not their advices and admonitions, etc.; then they likewise agree together, to desert them, and withdraw themselves from their communion: it may be, also, to call in the aid of the magistrate, to punish them with the civil sword, if the cause require it.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 62, 79; Ans. to 9 Pos. p. 77; R. M. to E. B. p. 12; H. W. to P. H.; Cott. Cat. p. 13.

Canne's Guide to Sion; about the midst.

Are not here, virtually, so many synodical decrees, etc.? . . Popular government, and want of authoritative Synods; the cause of their many schisms, confusions, and contentions; which, though by some dissembled, yet have been by others formerly espied, and now by some of themselves lately confest: see Mr. Parker's Letter to Mr. Baillie, lately printed." [And see *supra*, p. 295.]

" . . Why have you said so oft, in opposition to our way, that our churches 'have no power over one another,' whereas our churches have a power to 'withdraw' by non-communication; and that withdrawing, say you, is as much as your 'Synodical excommunication?' Why do you, so slight our churches' counsels and admonitions to other churches, as not being 'authoritative?' Whereas, if they be not obeyed, it seems, they can pass as sore a censure as all your Synodical authority; for you can do no more, by it, than 'excommunicate;' and so far, you say, we can proceed! . . Though W. R. thinks they are both one, I cannot: for that [Synodical excommunication] is positive; this, [non-communication,] only negative: that, after a sentence passed; this, not so: that, a cutting off from Christendom, at least for the present, and a giving up to Satan, etc.; this, only a cessation of conferring church-privileges, etc. By the one, the churches withdraw, and call in that only which once they gave, the right-hand of fellowship: by the other, the Synod or Classis take away that which they never gave or had power to bestow, the excommunicate's membership, in their own church. So that, when we stand for the one,—as having no rule to carry us further,—we do not establish the other! . . By non-communication, a man is only let go into the world,

where Satan's walks are: by Synods' excommunication, he is given up, and cast to Satan to terrify and vex him. . . 'Popular government' is one 'cause' of schisms, in New England: Mr. Parker's Letter. Blessed be God, that under that government of ours which you call,—or rather, miscall,—'popular,' the very neck of 'schisms' and vile opinions, brought to us from hence, was broken: when here, amongst you, where there is not such a government, they walk bolt upright amongst you, and crow aloud. You shall do better to lay aside this objection, till a Prebyterian government have healed these sore breaches in these churches here!

Chap. XV. Art. i. "They hold, the magistrate cannot, lawfully, compel men to enter into covenant with God; but being entered, they may and should compel them to keep their covenant.—Apol. p. 11, 12.

Rob. Justif. p. 242, 243; Barr. against Giff. Preface.

How will our late Solemn League with God and one another, stand with this? And, the *opinion* of many of them, that hold the magistrate hath nothing to do in matters of religion?"

"This Article saith, we 'hold the magistrate cannot, etc.' . . He means a national covenant! . . As long as I lived there, I never heard, or knew, the churches held so. . . Let him know, and all others, that all the churches with us do abhor that vile '*opinion*.' Some I believe, of Road [Rhode] Island, and some others banished from us, do hold so." . . T. W. p. 67.

Art. ii. "Christians may, and ought to, set up and constitute new churches, and practise in them all the ordinances of God, without the consent, yea, and against the peremptory commands and established laws of a christian state; yea, and that in the midst of, and against the mind of, such churches as themselves freely acknowledge to be the true churches of God.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 35; R. M. to E. B. p. 2, 3.

Yet they deny this to us, in their country. . ."

"He reserved a strange Article for the last. If I had not read it, I could scarce have believed it possible he should have written it. No pen can express a greater latitude of opposition against magistracy, and laws, and churches, than here he affirms to be in us. . . You shall hear his cited author himself speak. 'Ans. to 32 Q., p. 35, 36,' saith thus, 'Observing the things commanded of God, in a peaceable way; yielding due reverence to all in authority; I [aye], and praying for them. This observing God's ordinances, cannot be unlawful for lack of the command of man.' The scope . . is this, That Christians may observe God's ordinances, though they have no command from the magistrate so to do. Now, where is doing of this, 'against' his 'command'; . . yea, against his 'laws,' . . 'established laws'; . . a 'christian' state! . . 'Against the minds' of all the churches of God amongst us! These are, all, his own additions; that so he might load his Brethren with contempt. . . It is contrary to his own words, chap. v. arts. ii., iv. . He again crosseth himself, for . . he saith, we hold that Christians may, and ought to, set up new churches, 'against the minds of other churches;' and yet he, in his margent, saith that we 'deny' them,—that is, himself and some others,—any liberty to do thus! He must prove either that we hold him and the rest, no 'Christians,' or that we cross our own rules and principles; or else freely acknowledge a mistake in his word." T. W. p. 68.

"The Postscript.—Thus, at length, good reader, thou hast the sum of the 'Church Courses' of our New England Brethren: even the way that so many, that know it not or cannot judge of it, do so admire, so desire [!] And which themselves do hold forth, to us, as the only way of God; with such superlative commendation in their Letters to us, as if it were a perfect *idea* of the constitution, discipline, and government set up and *exercised* in and by the Apostolic Churches from point to point; from the beginning, till now of late, methinks they begin to abate:—see Mr. Parker's Letter to Mr. B. printed:—inculcating, what rare and admirable effects it hath produced amongst them; impatient that any should oppose it, or so much as question it; yea, threatening us with continuance of the sword until we shall embrace it! See Mr. Peter's Preface, p. i., excluding and exploding all other ways as erroneous, false, wicked, and savouring, at least, strongly of antichristianism. . . As for myself, I look for lashes from many hands and tongues; but in patience, through the help of Christ, I shall possess my soul, being supported by the conscience of mine own integrity. . . I pray it may be conceived and remembered, that I have not undertaken to report things as they really are,—which I could not do unless I had been an eye-witness,—but to collect their own reports of things scattered here and there in their own papers, and present them jointly together to thy view; so that whether their reports be true or false is nothing to me [!] [See back, p. 319, T. W. under chap. vi. art. xi.] If I can clear it to a candid and ingenuous reader, that I have not mis-reported their reports, I will be guiltless both before God and men. . . I shall desire of him, whosoever he be, that shall call the truth of this relation in question, for substance at least, that he himself would put forth a truer. It is a small thing to say, they hold not, or they do not, this or that, but tell us what they do hold and practise, that we may be misled no longer, as hitherto. . . Their 'courses' are not to be covered, . . seeing by forbearance all this while, they have fretted like a gangrene into the bowels both of city and country: and I fear we have kept their counsel so long that many of them are already past cure in their error, and *we* almost remediless in our rents, tending unto ruin. . . The press is still in travail, ready to bring forth more and new *confutations* of them. . .

"They sometimes cite and approve of the Brownists' books, in questions between us and them, and provoke us to answer them. . . They distinguish of Separation: one, they call 'moderate;' the other, 'rigid or bitter;' this, they condemn, but that, they own. But what they mean by this 'rigid separation' we well know not; for even the separatists themselves do condemn each other's 'rigour;' the latter generally condemn some bitterness used against our churches by Barrowe and Greenwood: and of the latter also, some,—as Robinson,—were far more moderate than the rest, yet were all of them complete Separatists; and so may these our Brethren be too, notwithstanding that distinction: . . yea, some assure us of profest correspondence and agreement between some of our late Apologists themselves and those of the Separation here. . . They withdraw themselves from all church-communion with us, in the best and purest of our assemblies; so they do not from the Brownists. . . And when they would seem to justify, and plead for us, yet then they do it with such uncouth and far-fetcht proofs, as we know not whether to accept or refuse their acknowledgment of the truth of our churches, upon such conditions, be the worse bargain: as when they say we have 'true churches,' because knit together in church-covenant, though implicit, because we had true churches planted here,—in the New England frame,—in the apostles' time, and perhaps also since, etc.—Ans. to 32 Q., p. 26; Disc. of Cov. p. 36, 37; R. M. to E. B. . .

"In like manner, the Brownists father their Separation upon the Nonconformists; but both sorts do it unjustly. . . See Mr. Ball's book against Mr. Canne upon that very point; and, in good part, by another book lately printed, called, 'A Grave Confutation, etc.' [See back, p. 272]. . . In such things wherein either the Brownists or these Brethren do mainly differ from other, the best Reformed, churches, they have no consent or approbation from the Nonconformists at all: nay, contrarily, by many undeniable evidences from their writings and practices, it will appear that they have ever stiffly opposed and conflicted with all Popular and Independent government, in behalf of that we call Presbyterial. True, indeed, some of them [the Nonconformists], especially in their polemic writings, while they had the Prelacy in their eye, and no considerable adversary but that to contest withal, did, perhaps, somewhat unwarily,—as may befall the best, and best learned men, in such cases,—let fall some few things which these Brethren make their advantage of: as that a

particular church ought only to consist of one congregation; that each particular church hath power to transact all its own matters; that this power is seated in the body! Many more than these, I do not now remember... But if any of them have gone far [further], as it is more than I know, so it is more than I will defend...

Objection: We see the most of the better sort go this way, now. *Answer:* I believe not 'the most' by many: but if it were so, that were no good argument to justify it; because, of those that do go that way, a great number are Anabaptists, Familists, and Antinomians, etc., who all willingly choose to fall into the same channel of Popularity and Independency. Perhaps, partly, out of design to make a more considerable—I say not formidable—party, that so either for favour or fear they may be the more indulged; partly, because it suits so well with man's proud nature; for every man by his [own] good will would rule; and no man would willingly, depend upon or be obnoxious unto another: Most good men's affections are strong when, oft, their judgments are weak: All men are ever apt to run into extremes; hence it is that while they flee Prelatical tyranny, they easily fall into Popular anarchy: The novelty of their course: The people's good opinion of the persons that way siding and drawing: And, the advantage the said persons have had, whereby to screw themselves further and further into the people's good opinion and affection; by being ever employed in the chiefest work of the ministry in some of the chiefest of our churches: although they have been so far from acknowledging themselves ministers as that they do not so much as acknowledge themselves as members of any of our churches; but,—as to us, according to their own rule,—altogether without. *Objection:* This seems to reflect upon our Brethren that come out of Holland, but these are not so rigid as the rest; what is this Relation to them? *Ans:* It concerns them, I grant, not so much nor so directly, yet in some sort it doth: because sometimes they tell us they are of the same way with the New England Brethren: both their disputes and practices, so far as they are known, do all look that way: their lying so close locked up and reserved, in many things, makes them,—I conceive, not without cause—the more suspected; for truth seeks no corners, no cloaks. If therefore now, by this occasion, they would please to put out, according to their promise, not a mock narrative, a mere gull, such as the last was [See back, p. 221,] but—as a true so—a full, perfect, and plain discovery of their opinions in these things, from point to point, and from end to end, I should heartily rejoice as in the much desired fruit of this my poor labour; that so all misunderstandings and misprisons being removed, and we rightly informed of the just latitude of their and our differences, we might either more hopefully address ourselves to satisfy their judgments or else, if that cannot be obtained, the more willingly condescend to move with them, for the favouring of their consciences according to the rules of piety and prudence, in such things as are capable of toleration and indulgence. But lest, good reader, I should be tedious to thee, I will cease to pursue these things any further, at this time." P. 50—55.

"A Postscript to W. R.—Now, I entreat you . . . to review your own work; weigh my Answer without prejudice; and consider well, how many precious saints and godly churches, dear to Christ, persecuted heretofore by Prelates, loving to yourself, without their least stimulation of you in this kind, you have, in your 'Narration,' extremely wronged. . . There was a law in Israel, that he that digged 'a pit' was not to leave it open, but 'cover it,' else whatever damage happened he was to 'make it good;' Exod. xxi. 33, 34: you are able to make application. Solomon, Austin, etc., never gained so much as by their retractations. There are some sins God will not seal up the pardon of till satisfaction be made by the party; defamation is one of them! It will be no grief of heart, but much comfort to remember, when you are about to leave this world, that although through precipitancy you did blemish your Brethren, yet [that] after consideration, you did again as readily wipe away the blot by a brotherly vindication as far as truth required: which

if, after conviction, you shall forbear to do, upon what pretences soever, how will you be able to lie down in your grave in peace?" T. W. p. 68.

CHAP. LIII.

REPLY TO A. S.

FROM the "Observations and Annotations" of A. S. in our forty-eighth chapter, we have advanced here to "A Reply of Two of the Brethren to A. S.: Wherein you have Observations on his 'Considerations, Annotations, etc.' upon the 'Apologetical Narration.' With a Plea for Liberty of Conscience for the Apologists' Church-Way; against the Cavils of the said A. S.—Formerly called 'M. S., to A. S.'—Humbly submitted to the judgments of all rational and moderate Men in the World.—With a short Survey of W. R., his 'Grave Confutation' of the Separation; and some modest and innocent Touches on the Letter from Zealand; and Mr. Parker's from New England.—The Second Edition. Corrected and enlarged. Licensed and Entered, according to Order. Lond. 1644." 4to. pp. 112.

These "Two Brethren" commence with "A Word to the Reader, showing the causes of this Second Edition;" which was "Not mere importunity of friends, though many; but to undisplease, if it may be, some of the contrary judgment, by blotting out some sharp expressions; though extorted, forced, and wrung forth, by the violent hammering and inculcating provocations of A. S." "And, to tell A. S. why no names at length were put to their book; namely, because he did not put his name at length to his, nor hath he anywhere in print owned it, that we know of. Therefore have the Two Brethren, who, only for despatch joined in this Reply to A. S. forborne also, in this second edition, to subscribe their names."

The preliminary remarks are introduced thus; "If A. S.'s heart^a be 'rent' with discontent in 'two' pieces, as he saith in his Epistle, at the innocent bleatings of that wronged Lamb, the 'Apology;' surely, our hearts more justly may be 'rent' in twenty pieces, to hear and see this roaring Lion-like Reply, with his many claws of 'Observations, Annotations, Considerations, and Notes,' rending and tearing that modest and innocent thing, and no man saying to him, Why doest thou so? .. How many Replies in a few weeks, appearingly, have turned the world, if not the church, upside down! Most men seeming to be resolved, before the arguments are solved! Believe it, it works more upon the spirits of the best men, than ever anything yet that befel this kingdom. Things, before, were irregular enough, but now, preposterous: before, resolute enough; now, violent: before, the Body of the Kingdom, the Commonwealth, was sore sick; now, the Soul, the Church!"

^a "Soul," in A. S.

"This one, single, simple, A. S., now starts up by himself, peremptorily to state and determine the Questions, for the resolution whereof the Parliament thought the Assembly of Divines few enough to undertake!"^a "Yet James Cranford is quoted by the printer, in the page before the title, as approving it, and the book, with a *licentious* approbation."^b "Mr. Cranford!...ask your reason, ask the book itself, Whether there be one true clause in all that you have said? Are these 'Observations, etc.' of A. S., 'judicious?'... Are they 'at this time, necessary,' when the grave Commissioners of Scotland had, with far more prudence and solidity than A. S., said, by way of reply, so much to the Apology, *nemine reclamante*, none replying till A. S. was abroad?"^c "Are they 'for the vindication of all Protestant churches,' whenas, in condemning the Apology, they condemn many, very many churches in England; many in Holland; generally all, in New England, notwithstanding some private Letters and Manuscripts sent over, to which we shall answer afterwards."^d "Are these 'Observations' for the defence of the authority of Synods, in opposition to the Apology? What Synods? Scripture Synods! Where doth the Apology whimper against them? Or, do you mean Classical ones? If so, that is the question! And so you proclaim a Defence of that which yet hath no existence: the question is not resolved!"^e "Well, Mr. Cranford, you have, by this, endeavoured to set Divines together by the ears *more Ecclesiastico*: your licentiating hath enabled men to give the 'second blow,' upon which the Common Law layeth the breach of the peace. And, notwithstanding you license these 'Annotations,' yet you say you 'reverence the persons of the Apologists!' A pin for such a compliment! Love me, love the truth... Away with your *dare verba*, your frothy words... Stand by, Mr. Cranford, and hear A. S. tried; and, in him, yourself!"^f

Proceeding to the Epistle of A. S., and beginning at the compellation; M. S.,—for here and in some other places his initials alone are set before the paragraphs,—tells A. S., "The authors of the Apologetical Narration desire more of your 'right,' though they have less of your reverence. Had I written a book with so much unreverence, I would either have blotted out my title, 'Right Reverend,' or else I should never have put in that episcopal style, 'Most Reverend,' and 'Right Reverend,' seeing that the Bishops are going! For, to stroke in the title, and strike in the book, is but flattery, if not gross dissimulation!"^g

A. S. having generally alluded to "particular opinions, wherein ye dissent from all Protestant, yea, all Christian churches in the world," M. S. answers, "Now let the 'Protestant churches,' to whom ye say you submit, judge whether in these words there be not a notorious untruth. For wherein do the Five ministers and their churches differ from many churches in England, divers in Holland, and generally all within the Patent of New England, if you account these places 'Protestant?' It may be you will object Mr. Parker's Letter, and some Manuscripts from New England; and a Letter from Zealand.^h.. There is a Scottish Church, of which one Spang is a very busy

^a P. 2.^b P. 3.^c *Ibid.*^d P. 4.^e P. 5.^f *Ib.*^g *Ib.*^h P. 6.

agent, at Trevere [Campvere] . . whence the Letter came. . .^a Most happily, by almost a miraculous Providence, in this nick of time, came two Letters from New England to countermand Mr. Parker's Letter thence, and the other from Zealand. The first, from Mr. Winthrop, Governor of New England, 'To his Reverend and very Godly Brother, Mr. Hugh Peters, Minister of the Gospel; These deliver in London.' — 'Our late Assembly, of about forty Elders, met; wherein the Way of our Churches was approved, and the Presbytery disallowed.—Winthrop, Gov., Dec. 10, 1643.' The second, from another of New England, to another minister in Old England, about the same time; wherein we have these passages: 'We have had,' saith he, 'a Synod lately, in our College, wherein sundry things were agreed on gravely; as, 1. That the votes of the People are needful in all admissions and excommunications, at least in way of consent; all yielding to act with their consent.—2. That those that are fit matter for a church, though they are not always able to make large and particular relations of the work and doctrine of Faith, yet must not live in the commission of any known sin, or the neglect of any known duty.—3. That Consociation of churches, in way of more general meetings, yearly; and more privately, monthly, or quarterly; as Consultative Synods; are very comfortable, and necessary for the peace and good of the churches.—4. It was generally desired, That the *exercitium* of the churches' power might only be in the Eldership in each Particular Church; unless their sins be apparent in their work.—5. That Parish Churches in Old England could not be right without a renewed Covenant at least, and the refusers excluded.' And, were not New England so far [off,] the churches in New England would soon send a third [Letter], punctually to approve the Apology; unless it be for their nearer compliance with them who, notwithstanding, have written against them!"^b

Noticing the full title of the "Most Grave and Modest Confutation,"^c it is said, "It cannot be forgotten, that the choicest doctrines held in England have been called 'pernicious' heresy. And therefore it is a high peremptoriness, in a general title, to call all those things 'pernicious evils,' some of which are truths. We have and do disclaim 'Separation' and 'Brownism' properly so called."^d

"England was never quiet, but worse and worse, since it hunted away almost a little nation of Saints to New England; though W. Rathband,^e joining issue with A. S., will follow them with a blotting pen in print, even to that kingdom too. Yea, and take in his way many churches in Old England, and some that are, and lately were, in Holland; and then, have at New England! None comes amiss that have gone an inch in Reformation beyond W. R.'s Nonconformity... And all this work he cuts out for himself in his book he calls 'A Narration, etc.'^f Oh, that all readers that will not be wilfully blind, would, by the way, observe how A. S. condemns the Apologists as guilty of dissenting from the churches in New England; and, W. R. condemns them for agreeing with the churches in New England! So that A. S. and W. R. do not agree between themselves!"^g

^a P. 7. See back, p. 219.^b P. 7.^c See back, p. 272.^d P. 11.^e See back, p. 289.^f *Ibid.*^g P. 12.

“The thrice-worthy Parliament had it in debate in the House,^a being put on by the Letter from Middleburg, in Zealand; and [but], upon the speech of learned Mr. Seldon, and others, they resolved, with a general acclamation, That the Apology was to be left as it was found, ‘unblamed.’ The God of Heaven in mercy bless the Parliament, as for all the good they have done, so for their uprightness therein. The joy of the churches is now as high as their sorrows would have been deep, had it been condemned! for it would then have been not only a doleful *ante* or *anti*, but ‘anticipating’ presage!”^b

“I am informed,” M. S. tells us, “that the worthy Commissioners of Scotland,—nobly done!—do utterly dislike A. S.’s book; from whom we have far more evident and effectual symptoms of their cordial love than the word ‘Brethren,’ which with A. S., in his book, is nothing but a ‘complimental dissimulation;’ for his Epistle begins as it were with kissing, namely, ‘Right Reverend and Dear Brethren,’ and his book is biting!”^c

Under the head of “His Considerations,” and remarking on the fourth, quoting those words of the Apology, that, since the change of times, from their “exile,” they had “endured” that which to their spirits “is no less grievous, the opposition and reproach of good men, even to the threatening of another banishment;”^d M. S. writes, “No doubt but the Apologizers know what they say, and what they can say, if called to speak out. Besides, if the people had let them alone, it should seem some ministers would not. Oh, it was an unhappy ‘Anticipation,’—Oh, if the will of God had been to have prevented it,—that, in the very nick of time, before the Assembly met, two books should forestal the market; the one penned by a learned Scot, and the other by a learned Englishman, that set the tongues of men so awake!”^e

“A. S. tells us of ‘the honour the Parliament showed the Apologists, in calling them to be Members of the Assembly,’ which was enough to justify their persons from all aspersions, without any Apology.” To this, M. S. answers, “That they and their friends will ever acknowledge the Honourable Parliament’s great respect to them... But,” he says, “I think I should not cross the sense of the Parliament if I should not make it a universal major proposition, That all whom the Honourable Parliament shall call to be Members of the Assembly are *ipso facto* vindicated from all aspersions; and so to conclude, That all Episcopal prelatical men, .. if they should be called to be of the Assembly, were *eo nomine* vindicated from ‘all aspersions!’ I am sure, *de facto*, that some very learned men were called by the sweet indulgence of the Honourable Parliament, for the common good, to be Members of the grave Assembly, who since, upon better knowledge of them, are, by the Parliament, purged out of the Assembly,—a good rid! the Assembly is the better for their absence,—and some are at Oxford; see how *terse* they be! And some, in prison; see how their Membership of the Assembly hath vindicated them! Be sure of it, that the choice of men

^a “Mar. 13. 1643-4.”

^b P. 14.

^c *Ib.*

^d Ap. Nar. p. 31.

^e P. 19.

for the Assembly was, to find men good, not to make them so. And two worthy Parliament-men of a County may not know, at first, all the faults in every town, or the lint on every black coat; and, therefore, since that, the worthy Parliament hath well brusht some." ^a

"A thousand, and a thousand, good Christians were glad to hear, how the Five ministers dissented from the rigid Separation, and closed with the best Reformed Churches; the sole business of the Apology in effect." ^b

On the "Eighth Consideration" of A. S., M. S. writes, "We challenge it as your duty, that are Protestants, to allow us our liberty, that are Protestants, and hold with you in doctrine, and discipline also, in substance; the difference being an accident: First, the quantity; *you* would have it extended to Colloquies, Provincial Classes, etc., over every church; which appears not in Scripture, either name or thing. *We* would have it bounded within every particular church made up to competent hundreds, with a sufficiency of church-officers for parts and numbers. And, secondly, necessity of constraint; for, in appeals, *you* would cite and constrain men to appear before the said Colloquies and Classes, etc.; for which there is not the least in the Scriptures. *We* would have a free voluntary recourse, out of conscience, to the brotherly advice of neighbour churches, or a synod, dogmatically to declare Christ's mind to us; and, in case of refusal to submit to their judgment, having no ground in Scripture to refuse, the advising churches to renounce communion with the offending church; and the particular church to pronounce 'excommunication' against their offending brother. So that the difference is not *in ente, sed modo*; not in the thing, but the manner rather. We say, therefore, it is your duty to give us our own, our liberty, as much—if not more—as we to let you alone; while both parties avouch that they are unconvinced, as yet, of a possibility of a nearer agreement. We know not of the least chance of a sentence or piece of an example in all the Scriptures, for any to constrain men's consciences by outward violence, positively to act contrary to their principles conscientiously held; or for any to yield thereunto. We have many passages to the contrary in Scripture." ^c

"We have seen the event of endeavouring to force conscience in matter of opinion or worship. On the one side, in England it made many thousands hypocrites, church-papists, time-servers, etc.: and on the other side, in Holland and Scotland it justly caused State-insurrections; and for the same reason, we also are legally now up in arms to obtain assurance that we shall have the liberty of conscience and law." ^d

M. S. it seems set limits to Toleration, since even he did not "approve a toleration to the broaching of all opinions, or any toleration of some practices." ^e But this he would have to be "only a suspension and intermission of the outward man from acting towards others; not a coaction or subversion of the inward acts of judgment and understanding in himself: and so, Jews, etc. may be permitted among Christians, so as they do not manifest their errors and defiance against the fundamental truths." ^f

^a *Ib.*^b P. 22.^c P. 22.^d P. 24.^e *Ib.*^f P. 25.

The other of the "Two Brethren"^a now commences his portion of this Reply to A. S. ; and, by way of preface, says, "Any man that shall but diligently observe the endless variety and multitude of keen expostulations, imperious interrogations ; the importune, peremptory, and insulting charges, criminations, and aspersions ; the wriggings, wringings, wrestings, wranglings ; the strainings, stretchings, stings, stingings ; the captious, crooked, and cross-grained interpretations of things, wherewith that piece is farced in an unreasonable proportion to the bulk of it, cannot lightly but conclude that Indignation was the chief Oracle consulted with, about the framing of it !" ^b

Referring to the "Anatomy of Independency,"^c and to the author's "false translation of straight actions into crooked reports," this one of the "Brethren" remarks, "Suppose his narrative of 'Independent' infirmities and miscarriages would abide the touchstone, yet was it a grand oversight in a man pretending to so much knowledge and wisdom as he seems to do in this piece, not to consider, Whether the dunghills of princes as well as of peasants, do not afford rags to them that will rake in them : Whether the 'Independent' story, though written by an adversary, yields that proportion in weakness, which the Presbyterian Commentaries, if but unpartially penned, would do in wickedness !" ^d He says, "There is another advocate for the Presbyterian cause stepped forth lately upon the stage, who adventures his name upon the confidence, it seems, which he hath of his work. It is intituled 'A Confutation of the Anabaptists : By T. B.'"^e This man, with a part of his discourse faces the Anabaptists, whilst with the main body of it he falls in upon the quarters of the 'Independents ;' in which respect, though I cannot justify him in his intentions, yet, as touching matter of execution, I judge him innocent : *animum nocentem, calamum innocentem gerit*. Independency, if I mistake not very much, will never fall by the edge of his sword !" ^f

He enumerates four signs when religious peace shall appear to be approaching in the world : "First, When men shall begin to grow to a clearness, singleness, honourableness, and Christian-like greatness, in their ends : making themselves and their own interests their footstool ; and the glory of God and the public accommodation of the world, their throne. This is one great sign that that golden age we speak of is at the door. The reason is, because there is no hope, scarce a possibility, of a general accord amongst men in any degree conscientious, but in the truth, or mind of God, revealed in the Scriptures. No other band is like to gather them all, or hold them longer fast together."^g "Another sign of those halcyon days approaching . . . is this, When apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, shall be no more turned into councils, synods, and secular arms. I mean, when men shall be freely permitted, without fear or danger of molestation, to consult with the apostles, prophets, etc. of what religion it were best for them to be, without having their judgments emancipated [*sic*], forestalled and overawed by the definitive, and compulsory determinations and allowances

^a John Goodwin, A.M. See his Life, by Jackson. p. 57.

^b P. 29.

^c See back, p. 238. ^d P. 31. ^e Query? Thomas Blake, A.M. ^f *Ib.* ^g P. 32.

of other men." ^a "Thirdly, When the generality of men professing godliness and religion, shall be content to furnish themselves with religion,—I mean, with knowledge in religion,—by smaller parcels, as the stock of their own judgments and understanding shall be able, from time to time, to accommodate them; and shall make scruple of taking it up by wholesale from synods, councils, and books, only for ease and cheapness' sake. This also, is as the putting forth of the fig-tree, which shows the summer of a universal accord amongst the saints to be at hand. The reason is, because God hath promised, and will perform accordingly, that if men shall 'apply' their 'heart' to understanding; and shall 'cry' after knowledge, and 'seek' her as silver, and 'search' for her as for 'hid treasure;' they shall 'then' understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God." ^b "Fourthly, When Christian States, and men of soundest judgment, greatest learning, parts, and abilities, therein, shall give free liberty to men looked upon as opposite in judgment to the truth, to publish and openly declare the ground and reasons of their judgment in each particular; and not compel them either to keep them burning and glowing in their own breasts, or else to propagate and vent them privately, and amongst persons that have neither learning nor abilities in any kind to encounter or oppose them. This is another hopeful sign, that the days of a general accommodation in matters of religion, are coming upon the world. The reason of this is plain; because, till Truth reign among the saints, Peace is not like to reign!" ^c

In stripping the Civil Magistrate of "any directive power in matters of religion," and putting on him, in the words of the writer before us, "instead thereof, the purple robe of 'an executive, coercitive, and external power only;' ^d by such an umpirage and decision as this, between the civil magistrate and himself with his fellow presbyters, hath he not made the one *judex*, and the other *carnifex*? The one must give the sentence, the other must do the execution! The civil magistrate is much beholding to the presbyter for giving of him a consecrated sword to fight the Presbyterian battles, and for persuading him to pull out his own eyes upon this presumption, That he shall see better with his! I perceive Presbytery is policy in the highest: and asks to put the magistrate between itself and the envy and discontent of the People; and yet, nevertheless, hopes to gain from the hand of the magistrate such an interpretation of this practice as thereby to be esteemed the best and faithfulest friend it hath in all the world... Surely, the frame and constitution of Presbytery is exactly calculated for the meridian of this present world... And indeed, A. S. himself is somewhat ingenuous in acknowledging that this government hath little or no relation unto or compliance with the world which is to come; professing, the 'external' peace of the church to be the 'adequate end' ^e thereof." ^f

"You must know, it is the manner of the Presbyterian school, to hang great weights upon small wires: for what need Dictators argue? But if it be the 'magistrate's part to take away superstitions, heresies, etc.,' ^g sure it is his part also to make himself able to discern superstitions and heresies from the true worship and truths of God! He is to

^a P. 33.^b Prov. ii. 2—5. P. 34.^c P. 35.^d A. S. p. 6.^e *Ib.* p. 13.^f P. 36.^g A. S. p. 63.

serve God in such a practice with his own understanding, and not by the proctorage of Presbytery,—as you tell the Apologists, that they must not ‘serve God by a Proctor,’^a—and if so, you must untruss, and deliver back again to him, that ‘directive power in matters of religion’ which you lately took from him. When the magistrate takes away superstition, heresy, etc., he had need have better security than a Synod can give him, to save him harmless in case he should mistake, and smite the Truth of God, instead of ‘heresy;’ and the true worship of God, instead of ‘superstition.’ Gamaliel might have had the full vote of a synod or council, for persecuting the ‘superstition, schism, and heresy,’ of the Apostles, but this was not security enough to him; he was afraid of fighting ‘against God,’^b this notwithstanding. And for my part, when the civil magistrate shall be far enough out of this danger of fighting ‘against God,’ I have nothing to say against his fighting with ‘superstition, heresy, schism, corruptions in manners, etc.’ Only my prayer for him unto God is, that he would give him a wise and understanding heart, to consider and discern whether usurpation over the judgments and consciences of the saints of God, in matters of religion, be not as grand a ‘corruption in manners’ as a church or kingdom is highly incident unto.”^c

“If the civil magistrate hath an actual coercive power to suppress ‘schisms, heresies, etc.’ because he is ‘truly Christian,’ which he had not before; then truth of Christianity alters the property and tenure of Magistracy, and that for the worse, in respect of those that are in subjection to it; yea, and possibly, in respect of the best of those that are in such subjection. Before he was ‘truly Christian’ he had, saith A. S. and Presbyterians generally, no power to punish, fine, imprison, banish, crush, any of his subjects, for the exercise of their conscience towards God; but, by virtue of that great mercy vouchsafed unto him by God in giving him part and fellowship with the saints in Christ Jesus, he is invested with a new power, to persecute the saints, and to make them pay dearly for having consciences better, it may be, than his own; at least better than to comply outwardly with what they cannot inwardly digest and approve. If this be the case between a Christian and the civil magistrate under whom he lives, he hath small encouragement to pray for the conversion of such a magistrate to the Truth, in case he were for the present, heterodox, or pagan.”^d

“But that ‘coercive power in matters of religion, for the suppressing of errors, schisms, heresies, etc.’ was never attributed to the civil magistrate by any Christian, but only by those that were very confident that it would be used for their terms, and to effect their desires: *ergo*, A. S. himself is wary and tender above measure in conferring it upon him; distinguishing once and again, and the third time also upon it, . . . before he dares let him have it; yea, and in the close, doth as much, in effect, as tell him, that except he be Presbyterian right down, and will accommodate him and his party with it, he ought not to claim it.”^e

“It is the impatient and importune desire of all ignorant, loose, lukewarm, and carnal professors, to have all Religions, as they call them;

^a A. S. p. 48. ^b Acts v. 24, 28; 38, 39. ^c P. 52, 53. ^d P. 59. ^e P. 61.

all ways, sects, opinions, and practices, in religion; wholly silenced, suppressed, and abolished, where they live; excepting only that one way and practice which shall be authorised and practised by the State. Because by this means, they hope they shall not be distracted about their religion; nor be put upon that sore trouble of seeking it they know not where nor amongst whom, but shall have it put into their mouths by the hand of Authority, which they hope likewise will stand between them and harm, in case it should not prove a religion of that purity and goodness which God requireth."^a

"Thus, I have given A. S. an account of my present thoughts touching that 'coercitive power in matters of religion' which he is so importune to put into the civil magistrate's hand with both his own; making it as strange and uncouth a matter as a 'new Independency'^b amounts unto that any man should not give the right hand of fellowship to his conceit herein!"^c

In proceeding to treat of the "Foundation" of Presbytery, this one of the "Brethren" begins by saying, "It is easy to observe, and yet well worth the observing, how A. S.'s hand shaketh, in drawing the line of the descent and pedigree of his Presbyterial Government. He knows not well where to find the source, first-spring, or original of it. He is between the Scriptures on the one hand, and the Law of Nature on the other; as the poet describes a fierce tiger between two droves or herds of cattle, 'he knows not which he had best fall upon, but hath a great mind to fasten upon both!'^d When he hath occasion to skirmish with the Apologists upon this point, methinks I see him traversing his ground as if he trod upon hot irons; he treads daintily and tenderly, and shifts his steppings to and again, off and on, as if he felt no ground under him but that whereof he was jealous. And it seems that for the whole family itself of persons engaged in A. S.'s judgment about Church Government, though they be but one, resolutely enough agreed for the government itself, yet there are great divisions of heart amongst them concerning the parentage and descent of it. Some, out of a desire to have it the more adored and revered in the world, will needs have it to be of the house and lineage of John's baptism, namely, 'from heaven;' from the Scriptures. Others of them, fearing that genealogy to be so perplexed and intricate, that it is fitter to make strifes and questions of than demonstration and satisfaction, think it better to waive that title and claim, and to content themselves with a Meropean instead of a Phœbean parentage for it: to rise no higher than the liberty or power of the Church itself, to seek its original. Which cleft in the house considered, it was a very prudent spoke put into the wheel of the Apologists by him that gave counsel,—if all tales be true,—at no hand to have it put to vote, Whether Presbyterial Government could be proved from the Scriptures, or not? Such a vote as this, might very possibly have proved of as interruptory a consequence to the builders of this Government, as the confusion of tongues sometimes did to builders of another fabric."^e

On this basis the argument is pursued with an ability and a boldness

^a P. 62.

^b A. S. p. 60.

^c P. 63.

^d *Nescit utro potius ruat, et ruere ardet utroque.*

^e P. 64.

which we have not been accustomed to witness in later times; and as the subject is of such relative importance now in connexion with our own practices, and was then so well calculated to reduce the assumed and boastful superiority of the opponents of Independency to their proper position, we must indulge ourselves in following this writer amply on so inviting a theme.

In this free manner he handles his opponent: "But A. S. is A. *per se* A, for aught that ever I could hear,—save only from his own pen,—in making 'subordination between superior and inferior Ecclesiastical judicatories,' that is, in plain English, Presbyterial Government, to be *partim juris divini, partim naturalis aut mixti*, partly of Divine right, partly of natural or mixt; which yet is his decision.^a When he affirms that his Presbyterial power 'needs not any pattern [patent^b] expressly and formally from Christ, it sufficeth that it hath one from nature;' ^c would not a man think that he waives the Scriptures in the question, as being completely furnished otherwise, to make good his standing? And yet within a few lines after, he glories too, in the superfluous and overabounding contributions of the Scriptures to him: 'And yet,' saith he, 'we can show a patent for it, not only from the Law of Nature, which should suffice; but also from the Law of Grace in the Old and New Testament.' In other places, he seems wholly to decline the Law of Nature, as if men by their prudentials, or power in any kind, had nothing to do to institute or set up any power in the Church, but by express order and warrant from God in the Scriptures: 'It is only in God,' saith he, 'who is a king in this spiritual kingdom, a Master in this house, a Father in this family, who can give power therein unto any man; we dare not be so bold, etc.'^d And, 'verity consisteth not in the 'middle' of this or that, which ye imagine; but in a conformity of our conceptions with their object and due measure; which, in this matter, is only God's Word revealed in the Scriptures: and according to this rule I take Presbyterian Government rather, etc.'^e And yet once more; 'Combined Presbyteries, *quâ totâ, sed non quâ totaliter consideratâ*,'—that is, no man can tell how or which way,—'judge of points of doctrine and discipline already revealed in holy Scriptures, and give us new Ecclesiastical Laws of things indifferent, and so to teach and rule the churches, etc.'^f Come, A. S., let you and I confer lovingly together of these affairs before we part.

"I wonder much, that having two Natures, at least, if not more, in your bowels, such material differences as have been touched [are] in your Presbyterian Tribe; nay, that having line against line, page against page, leaf against leaf in your own book, you should be no more compassionate towards your Brethren the Apologists than to bebrand them with differences amongst themselves as you do, more than once, and that with much bitterness.^g *Si variasse vocas crimen, variavimus ambo.*

"The differences that are amongst the Apologists and men of their judgment, about the Way of their Government, are nothing considerable

^a A. S. p. 27.

^b So it is in the Ap. Nar.; but in the tract before us, and in A. S.'s, the word "pattern" is frequently substituted.

^c A. S. p. 36.

^d *Ib.* p. 48.

^e *Ib.* p. 61.

^f *Ib.* p. 34.

^g "In p. 69, and elsewhere."

in respect of yours. They differ but in their hair, and you in your heads. They differ among themselves but as one star differeth from another; you differ between yourselves as much as heaven and earth. They all, as one man, unanimously affirm, That their Way of Government is canonical, and of Divine assertion: You are divided about the Authority of your Way; some making it canonical, others apochryphal, some fetching it from the stars, others from the dust! *Hinc caput atque illinc, humero exutroque pependit.*

“By the way, the ingenuous dissent of that party amongst you who cannot say that they see any lineament of Heaven in the face of your Government; being yet well-willers, and friends, of affections large enough unto it; is, unto me, as little less than a demonstration as may be, that your Way is but from men, and not from God. For, as the saying is, *Quid non sentit amor?* If there were any thing in the Scriptures that did but look merrily, or cast a plausible glance upon your way, would not they that are so entirely devoted, both in their judgments and affections to it, find it out? yea, and double and treble the sympathy and strength of it, with their imaginations? As it is the property of ‘love’^a to cover a multitude of sins or trespasses that are, so is it a property likewise of the same affection to discover a multitude of pleasing accommodations which are not! Besides, it is somewhat more than a mote in the eye of your Unity, that ‘in some churches, of your Presbyterial calculation, ‘particular, or parochial senates or consistories, have power to suspend from their communion those that be members thereof; yea, also, to excommunicate them, etc.’^b This is your own bounteous acknowledgment! I thought that such a misdemeanour as this, in the State-Presbyterial, had been of Classic vindication at the least.

“If Presbyterian Government ‘needeth no formal or express patent from Christ,’ then, either it hath none such from Him, or this patent, wheresoever it is found, is but a superfluity or impertinency of Scripture. But that there is nothing superfluous or impertinent in the Scriptures, is a glory asserted unto them by the Holy Ghost himself;^c therefore, by A. S.’s own confession, his Government hath ‘no formal or express patent from Christ!’ In one sense it may be granted, that Presbyterian Government ‘needeth no formal’ nor yet material ‘patent’ from Christ, namely, in such a sense as it may truly be said that ‘castles in the air need no reparation.’

“But if your Government ‘needs no formal or express patent from Christ,’ we would gladly know whether it ‘needs’ any material or implicit ‘patent’ from Him; or what it ‘needs’ from Him, whether something or nothing? But if you understood or would please but to consider the necessities of it, I verily believe you would confess that it did stand in ‘need’ of that ‘formal and express patent’ from Him, which you speak of. You see that for want of such a ‘patent’ it drives but heavily, and is long in getting up into its throne.^d It hath lost many a merry day already, and yet daily meets with such contestations, oppositions, contradictions, from sober, wise, learned, and religious men, that it is like to reign but in the fire of contention, and with the sorrow

^a Prov. x. 12.^b A. S. p. 26.^c 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.^d Prov. viii. 12.

and sadness of many such hearts as Christ would not have made sad. And all this calamity befalls it for want of a 'formal and express patent from Christ:' and yet hath it no 'need' hereof? Surely, it is very magnanimous and high spirited to be able to bear all this heavy pressure of misery upon it, and yet profess that it stands in no 'need' of that which would ease it!

"If it 'needs no formal express patent from Christ,' we would willingly be informed what 'patent' it is which you boast you 'can show from the Law of Grace for it in the Old and New Testament?'^a We suppose that it stands in 'need' of all that you 'can show' for it, either from the Law of 'Nature' or of 'Grace;' either from 'the Old Testament' or from 'the New;' and much more. You tell us you 'can' show patent upon patent, but show none. Surely, you would be thought to do very nobly: *posse et nolle nobile*. You do not 'show' us, but only tell us that if we 'will,' we 'may' see it 'in the ordinary practice of the church of the Jews in the Old Testament.'^b It seems that sight you have of your Presbyterial Government either in this 'practice' of the Jewish church, or in any other passage or part of Scripture, depends upon your 'wills:' you are willing to see it, and therefore you see it! Otherwise, why should you tell us, that we 'may' see it, 'if' we 'will?' You are happy men who have your eyes dependent upon your wills; and so can 'see' what you please, or have a mind to 'see.' *Nobis non licet esse tam disertis*; our 'wills' depend upon our eyes: we dare not 'will' anything but what we first 'see' to be the will and mind of God! It is no marvel that you cast it as a sore aspersion upon the Apologists, that you saw them 'noways minded to submit' themselves, in these matters of conscience, to the 'desires' of the Parliament.^c I verily believe, that, did their judgments depend upon their 'wills,' as it seems yours do, they would have been as freely willing to have submitted in all things unto the 'desires' of the Parliament as you are.

"But if our 'wills' be weak, and thereby are hindered from seeing that goodly vision of Presbyterian Government in the 'practice of the Jewish church' which you 'see;' what do you contribute or afford us towards the healing and strengthening of them? Nay, do you not rather occasion that which is weak in this kind, to be quite turned out of the way? For, when you tell us, as you do, that the 'adequate end' of your Presbyterial Government 'is the external peace of the church;'^d and, that the 'power' thereof consists, first, 'in the creation, suspension, and disposition, of church-officers;' secondly, 'in determining matters of Doctrine;' thirdly, 'in making Ecclesiastical laws concerning things indifferent, etc. ;'—all which you tell us on a heap;^e—you both make us very loath and unwilling to find your Government there: and, withal, very confident that there it is not to be found.

"For, first, Was the 'adequate end' of the Government of that church, the 'external peace' of the church? Had it nothing in design for the spiritual good, for the edification of the members of it in knowledge, faith, and holiness? Was the power of the High Priest given him only to keep the church in 'external peace?' I thought, that to

^a A. S. p. 36.^b *Ib.* p. 41.^c *Ib.* p. 4.^d *Ib.* p. 13.^e *Ib.* 42.

provide for the 'external peace' of the church, had rather appertained to the Civil magistrate and government than to the Ecclesiastic; and it is the Apostle himself that thus *thoughteth* me, where he enjoineth, that 'supplications, prayers, etc., be made for kings, and all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.'^a Secondly; Neither do I find in the practice of that church any power given to the combined rulers and governors thereof, for 'the creation, suspension, deposition of church-officers.' I read of the deposition of a church-officer, and no mean one either, by the Civil magistrate; 'So Solomon cast out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord;'^b but, of any such 'deposition' by the combined rulers of that church, I remember not that I have read.

"But as for any 'power' of 'determining matters of Doctrine,' this is further out of my ken, in the 'practice' of that church, than anything else. I know not well what A. S. means by his phrase of 'determining matters of Doctrine;' but in my notion, and in the grammatical and proper sense of the word 'determine,' the claim of such a 'power' riseth up as a high partition wall between me and his Government. If by a 'power of determining matters of Doctrine,' he means nothing else but a liberty or ability of discussing and arguing such matters, and of recommending the issues and results of such discussions unto the churches as consonant, in their judgments, to the Truth; with a proposal of their desires unto the churches, to consider well of them and to embrace them, if they can so judge and conceive of them; I have nothing to oppose against this 'power.' But if, by his 'power to determine' matters of religion, he means a 'power' of concluding or defining what men shall be bound in conscience to receive and believe for Truth; and shall be looked upon as sinning in case they do it not, whether they see sufficient ground for what is so concluded and obtruded upon them, or not,—which I partly believe to be A. S.'s sense, [and] I am sure is the proper sense of the word;—such a 'power' is, and I think ever will be, the first-born of the abhorings of my soul!

"I confess I cannot be over-confident that A. S. intends the residence of such a power as this, in his Presbyterian Assemblies; partly, because he speaks somewhat like a man in this behalf elsewhere, supposing it to be 'safe even for a few men to dissent from all the world,' in case they have 'very strong reasons for their dissent,'^c and requires no subjection in 'particular Congregations unto the judgment of Senates or Assemblies, but according to God's Word;'^d—I trust he means, so apprehended by the Congregation: without this, there is no subjection according 'to God's Word.'—And, again, acknowledgeth it as 'an undoubted maxim, that the church hath no absolute power in her judgments, etc.'^e with many savoury expressions in this kind: partly, also, because I find this indulgence generally subscribed with Presbyterian pens, 'That the Authority which Classes and Synods exercise is not absolute; nor their Decrees held to be infallible, but to be examined by the Word of God, and not to be received further than they do agree herewith.' And yet, on the other hand, I confess that I cannot

^a 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.^b 1 Kings ii. 27.^c Paget, Def. of Ch. Gov. p. 22.^d *Ib.* p. 28.^e *Ib.* p. 68.

conceive or comprehend how A. S.'s Government can hold up her head like herself, if this iron-mace be taken out of her hand ! For my part, if this one Article, Of a liberty to waive Presbyterial Injunctions and Decisions, in case of a *non liquet* from 'the Word of God' to him to whom they are tendered ; will be but assented unto, and candidly kept and performed ; it would be the best Mediator I know to reconcile my thoughts and judgment to it.

" Nor can I, in the 'practice of the Jewish church,' find either *vola* or *vestigium* of a 'power' granted unto the Rulers thereof, to make Ecclesiastical laws 'concerning things indifferent.' I rather find a prohibition served upon them for making any such laws : 'Ye shall put nothing unto the word which I command you, nor shall you take ought therefrom.'^a If A. S. can but produce one example of any such law or constitution made by them, he shall be a good benefactor to the penury of my notions ; and in consideration thereof, I will bestow upon him a dashing out of this piece of his charge.

" And, lastly ; In the 'practice of the Jewish church,' the Prelatical School sees a vision or Platform of her Government also ! And, A. S., by your leave, the High Priest, as well in his Authority as in his Robes and holy accoutrements, did far more plausibly sympathize with Metropolitcal state and greatness than with Presbyterial ! For my part, I am not able to discern in all the 'practice of the Jewish church,' from one end of it unto the other, any piece, strain, or vein of such a 'patent' as A. S. speaks of. Surely, the vision is so conditioned as not to be seen but upon Presbyterian ground. The man did wisely, in granting that he had 'no formal or express patent' for his Government, either from the Old or New Testament.^b But he should have done more ingenuously to have added, No, nor yet any material, or implicit 'patent' either ! For if he hath any material 'patent,' it is so purely material that it may contend with *materia prima* itself for the prize of Invisibility. If he hath any implicit, it is wrapt up under so many folds and plaits of obscurity that no seeing eye is able to pierce through to it.

" But do we not give sentence too soon ? It may be, his 'patent' from the 'New' Testament will carry it, though that from the 'Old' refused to meddle with it ! But where shall we seek this ? He tells us, 'Ye may see it in the History of the New Testament, in the judgment given out at the Synod,'—either truly, or untruly, so called,—'of Jerusalem ; concerning the business of Antioch.'^c What possibly we 'may see,' in length and time, is not easy to be determined for the present ; but I have both more hope and fear of seeing a thousand other things,—which yet I cannot certainly say that I shall see—than I have of either, ever to see Classical proceedings demonstrated out of that passage of Scripture. Nor doth A. S. so much as put forth his little finger towards such a demonstration, but contents himself, for the present, to threaten us with his own 'hope' of 'seeing' the business 'clearly demonstrated' to us 'by a better hand, ere long !'^d Clear demonstrations of any thing from the Scriptures shall be very welcome to us at any

^a Deut. iv. 2 ; xii. 32.

^b A. S. p. 36.

^c *Ib.* p. 41.

^d *Ib.* See on, p. 366.

time ; but, methinks I see such insuperable difficulties in the way, that I fear that 'demonstration' will never come out 'clear.' Yet, because I would help forward the clearness of it, what I can, I shall make bold to propound unto him that either is, or shall be, the undertaker thereof, a few particulars which, I humbly conceive, must be substantially proved, to make the demonstration 'clear,' at least to me and many others.

"It must be proved, That the Apostles, in that Meeting at Jerusalem,^a sat there only in the capacity of ordinary Elders or Presbyters, and not as Apostles : that is, that they waived or silenced the spirit of infallibility which was given them, and fell to work with the weak and fallible spirits of other men ; which is as if a man should pull out his eyes to see with the holes.—It must further be proved, That this Council at Jerusalem had their stated and set times of meeting ; as weekly, monthly, yearly, or the like ; and, that they did not assemble occasionally only. For this is one of the high characters of Presbytery, by A. S.'s own calculation,^b—It must be proved, That they had *Authoritatem citationis*, an authoritative power to cite and call before them whom they pleased, within the pale of Apostolical jurisdiction ; that is, within the compass of the whole world !—It must also be made 'clear,' That 'the Apostles and Elders' that were members of this Synod, were sent hereunto, by those particular churches over whom they had right to claim jurisdiction, or intended to include in their determinations.—The 'demonstration' will never be 'clear' till it be substantially proved, That there was none authorized to sit in that Council but only church-officers and ecclesiastical men : the contrary hereof seeming, at least, very apparent.^c—That likewise must not be left unproved, That this Council had power as well to make new Laws, of indifferent things, as to impose things 'necessary' upon the churches.^d—The Demonstrator, to make his work 'clear' and clever, must prove, That the churches of 'Syria and Cilicia' had their Commissioners and Delegates sitting authoritatively in this Synod ; because they are included in the determination.^e—It must be proved likewise, That Paul and Barnabas sate as Commissioners upon the same terms, for the church of 'Antioch' in this Synod.—It must be made to appear, Either that this Synod or Council would have proceeded as now they did, whether they could have said, 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us,' or not ; or, that ordinary Synods or Assemblies may lawfully proceed as they did, though they have no assurance of a concurrence of the Holy Ghost with them, as they had.—And, lastly, proof must be made, That those words, in the close of the epistle sent from this Council to the respective churches, 'Ye shall do well,'^f are fulminative, and import some such threatening or intimation as this, That if they did not submit, some further course must be taken with them !

"If all these particulars shall be substantially cleared and proved, I shall freely acknowledge that there is a plausible 'patent' for A. S.'s Government, in the 'New Testament : ' but, *hic labor, hoc opus est*. I

^a Acts xv. 6.^b A. S. p. 39.^c Acts xv. 22, 23.^d Ver. 28.^e Ver. 23.^f Ver. 29.

shall not prejudge any man's abilities; but for the present, I do as much expect the fulfilling of that poetical prophecy, *Unda dabit flammam, et dabit ignis aquas*, as I do ever to see that Fifteenth of the Acts safely delivered of the man-child called 'Presbytery.' Therefore, A. S. must pardon us if, as yet, we be not able to see any 'patent' at all of his Government, neither 'formal,' nor 'material;' neither 'explicit,' nor 'implicit;' either in the 'Old' or 'New' Testament!

"Well! but yet the man hath one string to his bow more: though 'Grace' will not relieve him, it may be 'Nature' will. He hath, as he saith, 'a patent' in the 'Law of Nature' which will 'suffice.'^a They must, I believe, have very good appetite to Presbytery, that will be sufficed with this 'patent.' The 'Law of Nature' is a very vast volume; and A. S. hath not quoted either page, leaf, or section of the book, so that, I know not whither to turn, or where to look for his 'patent.' But, methinks, the man himself hath given ample testimony to the 'Law of Nature,' that it is noways guilty of or accessory to his Presbyterian Government. For that which cannot be made out to the judgments and consciences of men, without the help of such a host of scholastic, intricate, if not inexplicable, distinctions, as A. S. is fain to levy and muster together,^b before he can make either head or foot of his business, what other original or descent soever it may claim, I know not; but, questionless, the 'Law of Nature' will not own. The Law of Nature saith, with one of Nature's sons, *Odi difficiles nugas*: she meddles not with subtilties, niceties, or curiosities of distinctions. A man that is unlearned and but of ordinary capacity, that shall read the pages last quoted, may very possibly take his odd and uncouth distinctions for names of unclean spirits, and think that the man conjures for his Government!

"But will you please to hear the names of his beagles with which he follows his game and hunts Classic Law out of those deep and dark caverns and tullians of the earth, where 'Nature' had hid it, *stygisque admoverat umbris*. The first couple, '*Actus primus*,' senior, and '*Actus secundus*,' senior: the second couple, '*Actus primus*,' junior, and '*Actus secundus*,' junior: the third, '*Actus primus*,' tertius, and '*Actus secundus*,' tertius: the fourth, '*Actus signatus*,' senior, and '*Actus exercitus*,' senior: the fifth, '*Actus signatus*,' junior, and '*Actus exercitus*,' junior: the sixth, '*Collectivè*,' and '*Distributivè*:' the seventh, '*Formally*,' and '*Materially*:' the eighth, '*Totum simpliciter*,' and '*Totum et totaliter*:' the ninth, '*Omne simpliciter per omne*,' and '*Pro omni et omnino vel omnimodo*:' the tenth, '*Totum, totaliter*,' and '*Totum modificatum*:' the eleventh, '*Divisim, et conjunctim*:' the twelfth, '*Per se*,' and '*Per accidens*:' the thirteenth and last, '*Totum confusum*' and '*Totum ordinatum*!'^c

"Can any reasonable man imagine that that conclusion, or practice, which cannot be justified or cleared to the understanding and conscience of learned, pregnant, and apprehensive men,—for these are no lettuces for illiterate lips,—but by the contributions and engagements of all these distinctions, and some others not listed, should be sufficiently

^a A. S. p. 36.

^b *Ib.* p. 29—32, &c.

^c See A. S. p. 29, 30.

contained in the 'Law of Nature?' The 'Law of Nature' is a book for every man's reading and understanding; but this volume of distinctions is scarce for any man's. If A. S. and his party would but spare the vulgar and common sort of men,—as there is neither reason nor religion but why they should,—from putting their necks under the yoke of Classic Government until they can plough with these heifers; I mean, till he or they have made them capable of all these distinctions, for my part, I should not fear much danger and inconvenience from it, except it were the intercepting or suspending of such a Government as might be a benefit and blessing to them whilst they are in preparing for the other. In the mean time, we clearly see that all A. S.'s Foundations for his Presbyterian building fail him. Neither the 'Old' Testament, nor the 'New;' nor yet the 'Law of Nature;' will consent to bear or to support any such fabric. Nor is all that hath been here said by way of contest with him about his Government any whit more than a first fruits of what is further opposable to it." ^a

Thus, having shown, in turn, "the independency on Scriptures" ^b of the Presbyterian system, this one of the "Brethren" follows out his refutation of A. S. by returning to the "justification" of his own system and practice. This portion of his Reply is headed, "Concerning the Form of Church Government maintained by the Apologists; commonly called,—*nomine ad invidiam comparato*—by the nickname of 'Independency;' by themselves, 'Congregational:' And, Whether A. S.'s exceptions against it be material, or of that moment that it should give place to its Competitor?"

He begins by saying, "For the Justification of this Government, in a *cataskeuastic*, or assertive, way, I shall plead nothing further, for the present, than what the Presbyterian School itself grants; conceiving that to be a ground impregnable, especially *quoad homines*, to found the lawfulness of it upon. I shall rather address to my antagonist A. S., and try whether he be any whit more dexterous at pulling down than we lately found him at building up. It may be, he is better at hiding than at finding

"But, first, towards the building up of the Congregational Government, this corner stone is given us by our adversaries, that 'Where there is no neighbourhood of congregations, or single churches, whereby they may with conveniency be aiding to each other, there a single Congregation must not be denied entireness of jurisdiction.'" ^c If we cannot, upon this advantage ground, make good this Government against all opposition, it is very ill bestowed on us; and we deserve to be punished with that which lifts up itself against it!

"But, first, If 'entireness' of Government or 'jurisdiction,' be not to be denied to a 'single congregation' when it is solitary, and without neighbours; then, certainly, it hath a lawful right, title, or claim to such a 'jurisdiction.' For whatsoever doth not in a way of equity or right belong unto any man, ought to be denied unto him. If then, a 'single church,' in this case, hath a right to an 'entireness' of rule and government within itself, I would gladly know by what right any other church

or churches, be they never so many, can take away this right or privilege from it? Those whom 'God hath put together,' saith our Saviour, in the case of marriage, 'let no man put asunder,'^a Doubtless, if a 'single church,' under the circumstance mentioned, hath a right to an 'entireness of jurisdiction' within itself, it hath this right conferred upon it by God, or Christ himself; there being no other fountain or foundation thereof imaginable. And if so, then, whoever shall take away or deny this right of 'jurisdiction' unto it, must show a commission from Heaven to do it, or otherwise be guilty of putting those 'asunder' whom 'God hath joined together.' Secondly, If a church yet 'single' be invested with a power of 'jurisdiction' within itself, and should be cashiered of this power by the rising up of more churches near unto her; then, that which is intended by God as a 'table,' should become a 'snare' unto her:^b she should suffer loss, and have sorrow, from those by whom she ought to be comforted. Thirdly, If a 'single church' should suffer loss of so considerable a privilege as 'entireness of jurisdiction' is, by the multiplication of churches near unto her; then cannot this church pray for the propagation of the Gospel in places near to it, but she must pray against her own comfort and peace; which is a sore temptation upon her either to pray very faintly or not to pray at all for such a thing.

"If it be objected and said, That 'entireness of jurisdiction' is no benefit or privilege to a 'single church,' but rather an inconvenience, or a diminutive privilege at best, and that her condition shall be improved, not impaired, by combining herself in point of Government with other churches: I answer, First; That the Scripture itself makes 'entireness' of government, or subjection only unto those that are of the same society or body, a special mercy, favour, and blessing from God: 'And their nobles shall be of themselves,' saith God, speaking of that great goodness he meant to show unto his people after their return from Babylon; 'and their government shall proceed from the midst of them.'^c So it is made a character or sign of the prosperous estate of Tyrus, that her 'wise men' that were in her, that is, of her own nation, were her 'pilots'.^d

"Secondly, Subjection unto strangers, is still spoken of as matter of punishment and sorrow; 'Give not thine heritage to reproach,—that the heathen should reign over it:'^e the nations of the Jews were expressly forbidden to 'set strangers' to rule over them.^f If it be objected, But pastors or elders of neighbour churches ought not to be looked upon as 'strangers,' but as Brethren: I answer, in a word, Though they be Brethren, in comparison of the unbelieving party of the world, and in respect of their spiritual descent from the same Father with them, yet have they more of the relation and consideration of 'strangers' to them than those that are, as it were, of the same domestic society with them. And, therefore, subjection to them, must needs have less of the blessing and more of the curse in it, than subjection to their own.

"Thirdly, The grants of government and rule, within themselves,

^a Matt. xix. 6.

^b Rom. xi. 9.

^c Jer. xxx. 21.

^d Ezek. xxvii. 8.

^e Joel. ii. 17.

^f Deut. xvii. 15.

unto towns and corporations, were ever esteemed matters of special grace and favour from princes ; and have sometimes been purchased with great sums by the inhabitants.

“ Fourthly, and lastly, Reason itself demonstrates ‘entireness’ of government to be a sweet privilege and benefit to a particular church !

1. In case a man be questioned, he saves a proportion both of time and labour of travel in respect of what he must undergo, if he were to make his answer at a Consistory further off.
2. Proceedings against him, in his own Society, shall be regulated, managed, and ordered, by his own pastor, who is a father unto him in the Lord ; and who, in all reason, and according to the course of, almost, all constant experience, is more tender, affectionate and compassionate, towards him, than the pastors of other flocks, and those that are ‘strangers’ to him. The Pharaoh that ‘knew’ Joseph, dealt well by him, his kindred, and seed ; but, saith the text, ‘There arose another Pharaoh, that knew not Joseph,’ and he ‘evil entreated our fathers, etc.’^a
3. He shall be tried and sentenced by those who know not how soon it may be their own case to be tried and sentenced by him again ; which, in reason, cannot but teach them moderation and equity in whatsoever they shall act or suggest against him. Whereas, a Consistory of standing judges, whose ‘fair necks’ have little or no cause to fear any ‘yoke’ of being judged themselves, are in far more danger, through a confident and constant use of the sceptre, of having their hand hardened and their little finger soon made as heavy as their loins. It is a good rule which A. S. himself prompteth us withal in this case, ‘Power seldom yields any good fruit, where it is too rank and luxuriant.’^b
4. It is a great encouragement and confirmation of face to a man that is accused and is called to answer for himself ; especially if he be anything tender foreheaded and bashful, as many of inferior breed and education are ; to answer before those whose faces are familiar to him, and with whose persons he is well acquainted : and the contrary, is a kind of oppression to such a man. Such an advantage, or disadvantage, as this, may easily amount to as much as either a man’s standing or falling, in the cause. A Consistory of strange faces, especially the persons being all of superior rank and quality to him, may be, to a plain man, of as bad consequence as the seeing of Medusa’s head was, among the poets ; it may turn him into a ‘stone,’^c and make him able to say [but] little for himself. Whereas, if he be to make answer at home, the knowledge and interest he hath of and in those persons before whom he is to speak will be a sovereign antidote unto him against such fears as otherwise, might betray him in his cause.
5. In this Government we speak of, by the Congregation, private Christians have the opportunity of seeing and hearing, from time to time, all the carriages, debates, and judiciary proceedings in the church ; which will be not only matter of much satisfaction, but also as a school of wisdom and experience unto them daily. Whereas, if these transactions be negotiated at a remote Consistory, the private Christian loseth his portion and interest in them.
6. Lastly, Conclusions, many times, are very offensive and hard to be digested, for want of the knowledge of the premises that should allay

^a Acts. vii. 18, 19.

^b “Nunquam satis fida potentia, ubi nimia est.” A. S. p. 10. ^c Ov. Met. iv. 781.

and sweeten them. Classic determinations and awards,—especially when they rise high,—the reasons and grounds of them being, for the most part, unknown to the generality of men, are of hard construction with them. Whereas, the issues and awards that are brought forth in a Congregation, the whole series and story of all proceedings, *à capite ad calcem*, being known unto all, must needs be much more satisfactory and of a far better resentment with men.—These Reasons might have been enlarged with much more strength and weight, and many others likewise added to them; but for the present, desirous we are that brevity should have the casting voice.

“Who then, can lay anything to the charge of this Government? That can I; quoth A. S. in effect: I have ‘sixteen’ reasons or objections against it!^a Yea, but A. S. your ‘sixteen’ reasons; or at least the greater part of them, as far as I can see; have all but one head: and if that be struck off, all those reasons are but as so many dead corpses. You allege against the Apologists, that the ‘remedy,’ in their way of Government, for the reducing of whole Congregations or churches in case they miscarry, or be irregular, ‘is not sufficient, nor satisfactory.’^b This you prove by laying your pen upon paper until you had ‘sixteen’ reasons, so called, in black and white. . .

“And for that defectiveness you charge upon the Congregational Government, for the reduction of whole churches under errors, miscarriages, etc.;^c I answer, 1. Suppose that course or means which the Apologists insist upon, a ‘withdrawing, . . until they repent,’^d be not, in the eye of reason or human conjecture, a means ‘sufficient’^e for such a purpose. . . The strength and power of sacred ordinances do not lie in their natures, but in their relations or institutions: now, that a ‘withdrawing’ of ‘Christian communion’ from persons walking inordinately, is an ordinance or means appointed by God, for the redeeming or reclaiming them is evident, 2 Thess. iii. 6th with the 14th verses. . . There is the same reason of churches in this behalf, which there is of persons; churches being nothing else but persons embodied.

“2. Suppose there were no such ‘sufficient’ or satisfactory ‘remedy,’ . . which yet there is, as hath in part already and will afterwards further appear; yet Lawyers have a saying, That ‘a mischief is better than an inconvenience.’ A man had better run the hazard of a greater loss, than expose himself to a daily wasting and consuming of his estate: A man had better be wet through and through with a soaking shower once a year, than be exposed, in his house, to ‘continual droppings,’^f all the year long. The delinquency of whole churches; such I mean, as is matter of scandal or offence to their neighbour churches; is not an every day’s case, no more in the way of Congregational than of Presbyterial Government. You acknowledged the rarity of it in your government; and we affirm it in ours. Now then, much better it is, to want a ‘remedy’ against such an evil; which, possibly, may not fall out within an age, though it be greater when it doth fall, than it is to expose ourselves to ‘continual droppings:’ I mean, to those daily inconveniences which we lately showed to be incident to the Classic Government.

^a A. S. p. 38—40.

^b *Ib.* p. 38.

^c *Ib.* p. 37.

^d Ap. Nar. p. 17.

^e *Ib.* p. 16.

^f Prov. xxvii. 15.

“ 3. They that implead the Congregational Way, for being defective as touching the matter in hand, seem to suppose that God hath put a sufficiency of power into the hands of men to ‘remedy’ all defects, errors, and miscarriages of men whatsoever. Else, Why should it be made matter of so deep a charge and challenge against the Way of the Apologists, that it affords not a ‘sufficient’ and ‘satisfactory remedy’^a either to prevent or heal all possible miscarriages in all churches? I would willingly know, in case your Church-transcendent! your supreme Session of Presbyters, should miscarry, and, in your Doctrinal determinations, give us ‘hay, stubble, and wood’ instead of ‘silver, gold, and precious stones,’^b—a misprison, you know, well near as incident to such Assemblies; yea, and to those that are more general and œcumenical, than so as obstinacy in error is, to Particular Congregations,—what ‘remedy’ the poor saints and churches of God under you have, or can expect, against such a mischief? Or, what ‘remedy’ you now have in the way of your government, for the recovering of yourselves out of such a snare, more than what the Congregational Way affordeth, for the reclaiming of Particular Churches? Nay, the truth is, your Government, in such a case, is at a greater loss in respect of any probable or hopeful ‘remedy’ against such an evil,—which yet is an evil of a most dangerous consequence,—than the other way of Government is for the reduction of Particular Churches! That, hath the ‘remedy’ of God, as hath been showed, though not the ‘remedy’ of men; and yet that ‘remedy’ of God which it hath is applicable by men, and those known who they are; namely, the Churches of Christ near adjoining. But, if your great Ecclesiastical Body^c be tainted and infected, though never so dangerously, God must have ‘mercy on you,’ and that in a way somewhat, at least, more than ordinary; if ever you be healed! For, that ‘Directive power, in matters of religion,’—which, had you left it in other men’s hands, might in this case, through the blessing of God, have healed you,—being now only in your own, hath not only occasioned that evil disease that is upon you, but also leaves you helpless and cureless by other men. . .

“ 4. Let us ponder a little, How ‘sufficient and satisfactory,’ that ‘remedy’ against the evil now in consideration is, which the Classic Polity, under the protection of A. S.’s pen, so much glorieth in. . . What if your ‘combined Eldership’^d hath neither footing nor foundation in the Word of God? . . If Presbytery be defective this way, as there is extreme cause to fear it is, this defect cannot be recompensed or redeemed by any other commendation whatsoever. . . If the Law of the State, be the first and most considerable band or tie upon men to submit unto the power of your ‘combined Eldership,’ . . then you must acknowledge that the root and base of your Government is *potestas secularis*, Secular Authority; and then, how is it Ecclesiastical, or Spiritual? A man may as well ‘bring a clean thing out of an unclean,’ in Job’s expression,^e as make a Spiritual extraction out of a Secular root! It will rest on you to prove, That the Civil State hath a power to form and fashion the Government of the Churches of Christ. . . Lastly, The ‘authoritative power

^a A. S. p. 38.^b 1 Cor. iii. 12.^c Corpora morbis majora patent. SEN.^d A. S. p. 39.^e Job xiv. 4.

of your combined Eldership' being granted unto you, we do not see how the inconveniences you find in the Congregational Way will be much better solved in yours. . .

"When your 'combined Eldership' proceeds against a particular church amongst you, upon offence taken; is not this 'Eldership' as well Party as Judge?.. Upon such a supposition, men, invested with authority and power, whether in Church or State, may be their own carvers, and serve themselves of the estates, liberties, and lives of those that are under them, how and when, and as often as they list. And why do you not submit to the decisive judgment of the King in all controversies depending between you and him, if that be your doctrine?"

"I shall be your debtor to tell me plainly and distinctly, What 'power' more your Government 'giveth to a thousand churches over one, than to a Tinker, or the Hangman, over a thousand?'.^a The glory and excellency of churches do not stand in any 'power or authority' that one hath over another, or many over one; but in other far more rich and holy, and honourable endowments, relations, and qualifications. It can be no prejudice or disparagement, unto ten 'thousand' of them, to say, they have no more 'authority' over one, than A. S.'s 'Tinker' or 'Hangman' hath over them! Therefore, if A. S.'s admired piece of Church-policy hath no greater commendation than to serve for preventing such 'inconveniences' as this, the world needs make no great lamentation over it, though it were in the condition of Rachel's 'children,'^b when she wept for them, 'and would not be comforted.'"^c

The subject of Toleration occupies the concluding section of the joint "Reply" of these "Two of the Brethren." It is propounded, "Whether the Apologists and men of their judgment may lawfully, and without danger or prejudice to the State, be tolerated: And, Whether A. S.'s reasons to the contrary, be of sufficient weight to persuade either to the banishment, crushing, or suppressing of them in any kind."

After some stringent general remarks, appears this passage: "If either God, reason, the peace or safety of the Kingdom, requires the sorrows or sufferings of these men, I make no question but they will be willing to dispense with all considerations whatsoever that stand up to plead their immunity; and will, with Isaac, patiently suffer themselves to be bound, yea, and to be offered up in sacrifice also, if need be. Only their humble request and suit is, that they may not be sacrificed upon the service of the ignorance, vain surmises, needless jealousies, bitter suggestions, whether of a few or of many."^d

"One A. S., it seems, is come forth with a band of one-and-twenty 'Reasons' to attack the liberty of these men, and to seize the freedom of their consciences and comforts for the use of the Presbytery, though his word be, 'For God and his Country!'"^e

"If it be matter of discontent to one Party, that the other is not of the same practice with him, you may confidently believe that the miscarriage in this kind rests on the Presbyterian side; the spirit thereof inordinately lusting after Unity in Practice, namely, Whether either

^a A. S. p. 39.

^b Matt. ii. 18.

^c P. 73—83.

^d P. 85.

^e *Ib.*

there be any unity in judgment or not: yea, or whether there be any ground for it or not, on the Dissenting side. You may prophesy of troubles and distractions likely to arise in families and other relations, with somewhat the less danger of miscarrying in your predictions, if you animate or encourage those that are or shall be of your Party, to make the fray!"^a "We cannot but know that relations were encumbered with such 'factions and divisions' as A. S. speaks of, even whilst the mountain of Samaria^b stood; I mean, when Episcopacy reigned, when yet there was no 'toleration' of pluralities of Church Government; though of Church Livings there was. Nothing is more frequent in and about the City, than for members of the same family to address themselves to several Ministers from time to time; the husband to hear in one place, the wife in another, the child in a third; for their better spiritual accommodations respectively, yea, and sometimes to communicate with several Ministers; without the least breach or touch of discontentment on any side."^c

"It can hardly be expected, especially in this Kingdom, where the godly and understanding party have so long suffered, and that in extremity, from a peremptory imposed State-Government, without any relaxation or mitigation, and have lately tasted the unexpressible sweetness of ease, peace, and liberty of conscience; that they should, without extreme discontent, be brought back into another house of bondage, where the furnace of peremptory subjection is like to be heated every whit as hot as in the other!"^d

"We conceive that every difference in judgment doth not make a schism in that Religion which is professed on both sides; we shall [should] then find abundance of the weed growing in the Presbyterian field itself. I myself know differences not a few amongst that party; and some not of the lightest consequence. . . . As yet, we have no Presbyterian Church or Government amongst us; and so, if the Toleration be granted before such a Government be established, it is apparently ἐξω βέλους out of the reach of such an imputation for ever. [For] if it be not a schism before, and without a Toleration, I do not apprehend what influence or aspect a Toleration should have upon it [Apologism], to make it one."^e

"If the question be so difficult above measure, to determine, 'what opinions are to be tolerated, and what not?' It must needs be yet of a far more difficult and weighty consideration to resolve what are fit to be countenanced; to be established; and yet more, to be imposed; to be enforced upon the judgments and consciences of men; and 'what not!' Toleration being an act of a far higher importance than either an Establishment, or an enforcement. . . . 'Gnats' must not be swallowed for any man's sake, more than 'camels.'"^f

"That 'the New Testament requireth no less union among Christians, than the Old did amongst the Jews;' we acknowledge the truth of what you say, but the pertinency of it to your purpose we yet desire. Though the 'New Testament' requires 'union' amongst Christians, and that very ardently and pressingly, yet it doth not 'require' him that is

^a P. 87.^b Amos iv. 1.^c P. 88.^d *Ib.*^e P. 89.^f P. 90, 91.

stronger to cudgel him that is weaker into the same 'opinion' with him! If you be of a better growth and stature in knowledge than we, and comprehend such truths as we do not yet understand, we are most willing, as far and as fast as meat and nourishment will do it, to grow up unto you; only we would not be racked, or stretched, to the same stature or proportion with you!"^a

"We know not by what authority or interest you undertake to secure them [the Apologists], that they shall not be 'pressed to be actors in anything against their consciences.' It may be you are but of the ordinary Presbyterian stature and pitch; and so, your mercies, though somewhat severe, yet possibly may not be very cruel: but, saith the Scripture, 'in those days there were Giants in the earth,'^b as well as men of the common standard; so we fear a party amongst you, of the Hyper-Presbyterian spirits, whose Spring-tides may swell beyond your Low-water marks."^c

"Good A. S., do you conceive the men would, under a Toleration, live 'without communicating at the Lord's table?' I know not what communion you have with their intentions of spirits, more than I; but for the present, I am no man of your belief herein. Toleration or no toleration, I believe they will 'communicate at the Lord's table,' and that oftener than twice a year!"^d

"The logico-divinity of your [following] 'Reason,' consisteth in this enthymeme, 'If we have but one God, one Christ, and one Lord, one Spirit, one Faith, one Baptism, whereby we enter into the Church, and are one Body; we ought to have one Communion, whereby to be spiritually fed, and one Discipline to be ruled by:' and if so, then ought not the Apologists to be tolerated!... Not, necessarily, that 'communion' or that 'discipline' which are of Classic inspiration; no more than those which are either of Papal or Episcopal recommendation... Though we ought to have 'one communion and discipline,' yet ought we to be led into this Unity by the hand of an Angel of light, not to be frightened into it by an evil Angel of fear and terror."^e

"What, though men [in New England] of the same 'profession' with them [the Apologists] miscarried for want of such light as should have directed them in a better way; must this be a band of conscience upon them to 'bow down' their backs without any more ado, and to suffer Presbyterian greatness to 'go over' them, as the stones in 'the street?'^f Nay; they have the more reason and necessity, in regard of such a miscarriage of their brethren, to 'sue for a Toleration' here; because, by that miscarriage of theirs, they are awakened to expect and fear yet far harder measure from you and your party, if they do not bestir themselves, by some means or other, to prevent it!"^g

"They desire a Toleration for themselves and their churches in the Civil State; not that the errors which spring up in their churches should be suffered to fret like gangrenes,^h without being opposed by them; or, be protected by the State."ⁱ

^a P. 92.^b Gen. vi. 4.^c P. 94.^d P. 95.^e P. 99.^f Isai. li. 23.^g P. 105.^h Did this word, in this place, suggest to Edwards the title of his several parts "Of Gangræna?"ⁱ P. 107.

“Every man that saith ‘I am of Paul,’ or ‘I am of Apollos,’ is not to be taught by ‘thorns’ and ‘briers,’—as Gideon taught the men of Succoth,^a—to speak better, by fining, imprisoning, unchurching, or the like; but by soundness of conviction, and wholesomeness of instruction from the Word of God. The Germans have a saying, that *etiam in latrone puniendo potest peccari*, a man may sin in punishing him that most of all deserves it! It is not enough for us to correspond with God in his ends, but we must keep as close to Him in his means also.”^b

“You tell us, that the Government so called, cannot but ‘overthrow all sorts of Ecclesiastical Government.’ Is Saul also among the prophets?^c *Hæc verba loquentis ab ore, Gaudens arripio, et stupefactus Numine, adoro*: I joy over these words, and reverence them for what I conceive to be of God in them. We know who prophesied when he was not aware of it. Indeed, by the beauty and perfect consonancy of this Government with the Word of God, it may very reasonably,—yea, and upon higher terms than of reason,—be thought that, in time, it cannot ‘but overthrow all sorts of Ecclesiastical Government,’ and stand up, itself, in their stead. *Faxit Deus, et festinet*. But that which you add, plainly showeth that you had no mind to prophesy, though God had, or might have, by you: for here you say that ‘this order, by necessary consequence, will breed all sorts of disorder!’ No: first; it will not ‘breed’ the disorder of oppressing conscientious men for conscience’ sake: nor, secondly; of discouraging men from searching the Scriptures more narrowly: nor, thirdly; of having recourse unto the Word for the setting up of the Government of Christ’s kingdom: nor, fourthly; of making men walk sundry miles for what they might have upon as good or better terms at home: besides a thousand other ‘disorders,’ which the ‘order’ of *your* Independency will never ‘breed’ by any consequence at all, ‘necessary’ or unnecessary; being of a very sovereign importance to prevent them... The ‘Independent churches,’ as you call them, ‘have no such custom’^d as for ‘one’ to give entertainment or admission to any person that hath been ‘censured’ by ‘another,’ without the censure [having been] first relaxed by that church which inflicted it, or without the consent of this church. This is their reproach, not their practice.”^e

“As for his after-birth of ‘Reasons,’ since he professeth himself that he omits them,^f we shall comport with him herein, and ‘omit’ them also. I hope he will think himself a debtor to us for this compliance. .. His Horsemen, you see, have been overcome, and yielded themselves: his Infantry knows the manner of the field, and will, no question, surrender without encounter: nor, is there anything for weight or substance in this tail of ‘Reasons,’ but what hath been broken already in the head.”^g

^a Judges viii. 16.^b P. 107.^c 1 Sam. x. 12.^d 1 Cor. xi. 16.^e P. 111, *ult.*^f A. S. p. 65.^g P. *ult.*

CHAP. LIV.

EDWARDS'S ANTAPOLOGIA.

WE have seen it stated directly in one place,^a and perhaps indirectly in another,^b that an attack was prognosticated by the Apologists, from the pen of him who proved himself the most notorious heresy-hunter of his age, and whose several treatises, one of which we have introduced under the year 1641, are a farrago or "collection of such faults," as, like Epiphanius before him, procured for his works little more notoriety than for being "full of inaccuracies and errors."^c To subserve the purposes of our undertaking, we shall proceed to avail ourselves of what concerns it in the prognosticated treatise. And, while reflecting on this, and the other antagonist productions which the "Apologetical Narration" gave rise to, we cannot but advert to St. James's exclamation, "Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!"^d Such was, indeed, the case, in relation to the bulky piece intituled "Antapologia: Or, A Full Answer to the 'Apologetical Narration, etc.' Wherein is handled many of the Controversies of these times.—Humbly also submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament.—By Thomas Edwards, Minister of the Gospel.—1644." 4to. pp. 367.

It will be recollected, that after having recorded the title of the "Narration," we gave also the Licensor's precognition, authorising the printing of that tract. Edwards's treatise has likewise a Licensor's allowance; but, though a divine of the same denomination with Herle, Cranford so far differed from him as to dissent from the commendation which Herle had bestowed so liberally, yet consistently, on the Narrators. As it furnishes another specimen of what was practised in those times, when the press was under restrictions which happily for its future freedom called forth, in this same year, Milton's "Areopagitica," we give the terms of the "Imprimatur," as it stands facing the title-page: "Having diligently perused this 'Antapologia,' I find it so full, and just, and necessary, an examination and discovery of the 'Apologetical Narration,' both in matters of fact and of opinion, that because I dare not—as too many—have 'the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons,'^e I approve it to be imprinted; and commend it, Reader, to thy most serious consideration.—Ja. Cranford." He had previously, June 7th, 1644, set his hand to the single word "Imprimatur," before the "Anatomy of Independency." And he will be met with at least once more, in this capacity, in a subsequent page.

Edwards starts with the announcement, that he had drawn up this present Answer to "undeceive" the tender-conscienced, scrupulous, doubting Christian" in the "Apologists, the Apology, and their churchway; and, to satisfy them in their scruples and doubts about Presby-

^a See back, p. 246,

^b *Ib.* p. 354.

^c See Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. Cent. iv. pt. 2. chap. ii. sect. 9. Maclaine's Edit.

^d Chap. iii. 5.

^e Jas. ii. 1.

tery." It appears, however, in the same page of his Epistle to the Reader, that there existed "many prejudices" both against his "person and the book," which he sought to abate by comparing his own "sufferings, troubles, patience, and labours," with those of "the exile, patience, etc." of the Apologists; but he tells us, with modesty not very characteristic, that he was deterred, in part, lest he might "become a fool in glorying!"^a

Besides other grounds calling for his Answer, he writes, "within these few days, just before the Antapology was coming forth, a pamphlet, intituled 'The Anatomist Anatomised,' was printed,^b rather to prepossess the reader against the Antapology than to answer the 'Anatomy of Independency;'" against which pamphlet even Edwards's spleen seems unusually excited.

"As for a judiciary proof," he says, "of all matters of fact in my Antapology, I not seeing those Letters writ; and most of my Letters being but copies; and many of the facts being done beyond the seas; considering also, it is possible the relators may mistake in some things, I cannot positively and judicially swear and make out such a kind of proof!" And he expresses his apprehension that Simpson's "book," so far as it concerns the Antapology, "may be a block in the way of it." That this "forthcoming" Antapology is "full of bitterness, malice, reproaches, and railings;" Edwards is sorely vexed at such prepossessions having gone abroad; thus quickly forgetting that he had himself just said, "I conceive Mr. Simpson's guilt and consciousness caused fear; and fear that hastened him to thrust forth something in the way of the Antapology, to blast the credit of it before it was come forth: and the truth of it is, he, of all the Apologists, hath been most faulty both in Holland and England."

The "Apology," Edwards goes on to say, "contains matter of high praise of themselves and their party,—a few inconsiderable persons, comparatively;—with many close and dangerous insinuations against all the Reformed Churches, which cannot be answered particularly without some recrimination and charge!" After this, and much more, the following passage may be instanced as a curiosity in one of the works of "Thomas Edwards, Minister of the Gospel:"—

"In many passages of this Answer, I do, upon several occasions, give the Apologists a just testimony of that worth for parts and piety which is in them; and speak to them, and of them, as Brethren: so that let but all these things be laid together, considering also the rules of Scripture in such cases, and that I intended a plain particular downright answer; and this Answer will then be accounted candid, moderate,—my pen dipped in oil, and not in vinegar!"

And to add to the interest on behalf of the Apologists, "The truth is," says Edwards, they "have been too much flattered, both in their persons and church-way; and they are undone for want of being dealt with plainly and freely. A candlestick hath been too much held out to them; and I hope this Answer may do much good, even to abate their swellings and confidence!" But our reader's interest and curiosity will be still further excited on perusing the final sentence of this introduc-

^a 2 Cor. xii. 11.

^b See back, p. 244.

tory portion of the Antapology:—"I conclude this Epistle, as Beza doth his to Duditius, 'Farewell: The Lord keep thee and all thine from all evil; and especially from noonday devils which walk about in this place, and in these times;' that is, from the errors of Anabaptism, Brownism, Antinomianism; Toleration of Sects and Schisms, under pretence of liberty of conscience!"

Having thus to do with one of the most cavilling and verbose of writers, we shall be compelled to set a more than ordinary restraint on the inclination to illustrate the practices and modes of treatment peculiar to this singular character; who tells us that he had "taken up a fixed resolution, never to give over writing till this Church be settled, and these great Schisms amongst us healed."^a Could we, for instance, suppress such a passage, to begin with, as even the second page affords? "Into what remote and far country were you banished? And what were the companions of your exile? Certainly the Reader.. will think, 'Alas, good men, Into what Patmos, Indies, or remote wilderness, were they banished and forced to fly!' and will never imagine that these men were the exiled Ministers, and this their exile, who, in a time of common danger and suffering in their own Land, went with their wives, children, estates, friends, Knights, Gentlemen, and Citizens, over into Holland; where they lived in safety, plenty, pomp, and ease; enjoying their own ways and freedom; and, when the coasts were cleared, came over into England, were entertained and received with all respects and applause, and are now 'Members of the Assembly of Divines!'"

"As for this 'Apologetical Narration,'" says Edwards, "The learned Licenser having lived remote, till of late, was strongly deceived to give such a testimony to it." And then, as it were to counterbalance that testimony, Edwards would make the world his debtor, in these terms, "My judgment of it is this, That it is indeed cunningly and advantageously drawn up for to take and deceive good people; to gather, increase, and confirm their party by it; being full of specious and glorious pretences, and all plausible seeming compliance and correspondency with the churches they depart from. And, therefore, my scope in this Answer is the endeavouring to undeceive the people, and to wipe off the paint; and to show the snake under the green grass, and the foul hand under the white glove! And, upon the thorough and full examination of the book, I can bring in this just charge against it, that there is not only fraud in relating part of the story and opinions, and not the whole; holding out the bright side of the cloud, but hiding the black; but there are many manifest untruths in some of their relations, and that even where God and men are called to witness: and I could in most passages of the Apology which are matters of fact, write quite the contrary to what they affirm. Besides that, some passages in the book cross and interfere with others; as also, there is a dealing in generals and in the clouds, with many doubtful and double expressions, like Apollo's oracles; there being few passages of moment either in matter of fact, or opinion, but they are so framed that they may receive a double construction, and that sense which according to grammar and ordinary acceptation they carry, cannot be meant."^b

^a Epist. sup. ap. fin.

^b P. 3, 4.

Having shown what is the gravamen of the charge which Edwards brings against the Apologists; he turns shortly to themselves, and accosts them in these terms, "You make the ground and occasion of setting forth this Apologetical Narration now, to be, your 'ears of late so filled with a sudden and unexpected noise of confused exclamation' interpretatively 'reflecting' on you." And, taking upon himself to be their interpreter, he affects to ask, "Shall I tell you what is judged to have rather enforced you unto this work?" He then bestows upon them his gratuitous information: "Many of the ministers of the City, not long before, drew up a Letter to the Assembly concerning some Church grievances; and, in particular, that of gathering of churches, and drawing away their people. Which Letter, as it was not directed in particular against you, so it reflected, in the words and sense, upon many others rather than yourselves. . . Soon after, some Considerations were put forth by the Assembly, to dissuade from gathering churches. To which Considerations your hands were subscribed.—Upon what reasons you complied in that, and whether you could not well avoid it without greater prejudice to your cause, you know best!"—And now, turning from them, he asks more indirectly, "Whether this 'Apologetical Narration' was not first hastened to follow upon those Considerations, to counterbalance that act of yours against further gathering of churches, that your cause and way might receive no loss and prejudice, and to satisfy your own party;—many of them greatly exclaiming against you for your hands to these Considerations;—and so, thinking by this aftergame, to recover all? I leave the reader to judge! Whether also, you, knowing that the Assembly was upon the borders of the main points in difference, and upon coming to debate presbytery, ordination, excommunication, you put not forth this book to taste and try the spirits of the Assembly and others beforehand? Whether, also, this was not intended to prepossess the people's minds to lay in prejudice against what the Assembly might determine: and, by discovering yourselves so beforehand, and so publicly engaging yourselves, your party might appear, and stand the more by you and with you, for a Toleration; the great design of the men of this way, in these times? Lastly, Whether, as much as you durst, this Apology was not set out just upon the coming in of our brethren of Scotland to our help, to asperse the government and reformation of the Church of Scotland; and, to lessen the esteem of that kingdom and church, so much and so deservedly valued by this kingdom; but looked upon by all the men of the new-church-way, as the great let of the Independent government?"^a

"That you could not stay a little longer," exclaims this querulous opponent, "but in such a time, when we need so much assistance of our brethren of Scotland, and the help of all other Reformed Churches, in the face of the Parliament, Assembly, and the Kingdom, to put out such a piece and to do such an act as this, is beyond all example!" Anon he writes, "But, however, this is the first 'discovery' of yourselves, in this way, with all your hands subscribed; yet we have had a discovery of you for some years past, both in your practices of with-

^a P. 5, 6.

drawing from our public assemblies, and in gathering and constituting separated churches." ^a

"But let me ask you, Whose 'misapprehensions' do you understand you lay under, that you present this Apology to the Parliament, and 'appeal' to them?... What Ministers have had the sun of their favour shining upon them, more than yourselves? You have all been made Members of the Assembly by them, called to preach before them upon their public solemn occasions; and some of you employed in extraordinary services!... M. S., your new great friend, sets the brand of 'malignancy' ^b on them who are against you." ^c

From all this, and more preliminary matter, "before" he descends to "answer," as he says, "all the particulars contained in this 'Narration,'" ^d Edwards advances with sufficient self-importance to where he breaks forth in this strain, "How dare you affirm, that for your 'consciences' you were 'deprived at once of whatever was dear' to you?...^e What great deprivation 'at once' is this, of whatever is 'dear,' for men to take their own times, and to go in summer-time with knights, ladies, and gentlewomen, with all necessaries into Holland; and there to take choice of all the land where to reside; and with wives and children, in the midst of friends and acquaintance, free from the fears and possibilities of vexations of the Spiritual courts and prisons, to enjoy all plenty and freedom as you did? There are many would have been glad, and still would be, of such a deprivation 'at once,' as to be so exiled into Holland, to be able to spend two or three hundred pounds, per annum, there!" ^f

With subtilty and effrontery almost peculiar to himself, he tells the Apologists, "You had also some 'ends' and 'interests,' and 'worldly respects' to comply with in your going into Holland rather than New England, which you first intended. And these may fitly be termed 'State-ends' and 'political interests,' namely, that when some great persons, Lords and others, should be forced, through the badness of the times—as was expected and feared—to seek for shelter in Providence and Hispaniola, you might be there ready to remove with them, . . . where you hoped to set up new churches and subdue those countries, and people which should come over, into your mould. Or, if otherwise, things in England should come to have a great turn,—as they had by this Parliament,—then, also, by being in Holland rather than New England, you were nigh hand, and your estates more at command quickly to return to England, . . . hoping you might either subdue England into the way of your church-government, or else gain a great party to you in the kingdom; which we see is unhappily fallen out!" ^g

Knowing the man's disposition, the Apologists might not heed Edwards's pertinacity; but he seemed determined that if they were intitled to any portion of good report, they should not lose the recollection of the evil report which his own party had contributed to raise and

^a P. 7, 8.

^b "M. S. to A. S., p. 83," altered, in a second edition, to "A Reply of two of the Brethren to A. S., &c. 1644." Chap. v. p. 85. See back, p. 341. ^c P. 10, 11.

^d P. 13.

^e Ap. Nar. p. 3.

^f P. 26.

^g P. 28.

disseminate. "Whatever you say," he tells them, "it seems that a great part of what the good old Nonconformists writ, came not much commended to you, because you follow it no better. As to that passage about the 'Separation,' following the passage of the 'Nonconformists'; . . . this is one of the best passages in your book; as there are four passages, among so many bad, that are good and useful: one, of the Parliament; a second, of the Assembly of Divines; the third, this of the Separatists; the fourth, a description of many of the professors and people of this kingdom. But it had been better," he now tells them, "you had made so good use of this observation and inquiry in God's visibly witnessing from heaven against the Separation; in giving them up to fearful sins, in inflicting fearful judgments, and leaving them to strange divisions; which yourselves allude to in this passage, and you know was in the stories of Browne, Bolton, Barrowe, Smyth, Johnsons, etc., so as to have kept further from their principles, and thereupon to have feared forsaking communion with our churches, and setting up separated assemblies, and agreeing so much with them in most of the fundamental and essential principles and practices, . . . as only to refine and qualify Brownism, and to spin it of a finer thread than the old Separatists did. But let me here put this dilemma to you; seeing 'the Separatists' fatal miscarriages and shipwrecks' did put you 'upon an inquiry' into the principles and causes of their divisions, . . . if you did not discover them, why do you insert these words here; . . . but if you did discover those principles of the Brownists, . . . why do you pass them over in silence?"^a

Again, thus he accosts them, "How can I believe this profession, That ye 'would hold communion with the churches of England, as the churches of Christ,' under the greatest 'defilements;' whenas you have never held communion^b with any of them in the time of their greatest reformation and purity? In this three years last, since your coming over, wherein we have been so free from pollution in worship; and since, that in so many churches in London there hath been the total laying aside of prescribed Forms of Prayer, and that great care to keep away both ignorant and profane persons; which of you Five have received the Lord's supper in any of *these* 'true churches and body of Christ?' I never could learn that any of you Five, nor any of the members of your churches, have communicated with us. I can tell you of the adding to *your* church assemblies great numbers since, and of your receiving the Lord's supper at night in private houses; and how some of you who have not churches here in London, go to separated churches to partake in the Lord's supper! . . . I know no 'communion' you 'did' hold, or do, with us now, though so reformed. And if you do, and will, what means that wall of partition between us, your new-constituted churches? As for the hearing of sermons sometimes in our churches, and preaching in our congregations; I doubt whether you 'hold' that a keeping 'communion' with our churches and ministers; but rather, preach as gifted men, and hear as gifted men; and, however,—if Mr. Robinson, and some of your way, may be believed—they

^a P. 33, 34.

^b The phrase of the Apologists is, "we both did, and would, hold a communion, &c." p. 6.

hold 'hearing of the Word' no act of communion, nor no proper, nor peculiar thing of the church.^a And that you are of the same judgment, I have great reason, both from your principles and practice, to think so."^b

Some pages forward, he writes, "Whatever 'right-hand fellowship' and 'brotherly correspondency' you might hold with the Dutch divines, some of the English ministers of the Reformed Churches there have complained of your great strangeness and distance towards them; and instance hath been given me particularly, . . . that when some of you have come to Amsterdam, you never would go to Mr. Herring's, a 'good old Non-conformist,' but have gone to Mr. Canne's, the Separatist, and to his church." And what restless activity Edwards used to gather anything to damage the reputation of these Apologists, appears where he tells them, "I sent over into Holland some questions about the truth of some things related by you in this Apology." Part of the answer, which he records here, is, that "For their going to the Brownists', and conversing with Mr. Canne more than us, that is undeniable; what you may of this read in the Epistle to the Rejoinder in defence of Mr. Bradshaw, against Mr. Canne, is most true." So he proceeds, a little after, "The 'granting' to two of your churches 'public places' to worship in, with 'maintenance' for some of your ministers," will not, he remarks, "free you from being looked upon as Sects by the churches and ministers there. But I must tell you these privileges are from other grounds; as, namely, one of your churches, consisting of many persons of great quality, and going at first to a privileged place; the other church having formerly been a church in the way of the Reformed Churches there, and so had then the allowance of a 'public place.' The first sensible declining of that church to the new way, being by Mr. Peters, before he went to New England. Now, Mr. Bridge coming to that church, and bringing with him and after him, wealthy citizens and clothiers, by which the magistrates at Rotterdam knowing well their advantage, no wonder though they permitted that church their 'public place,' and gave to their ministers 'a full and liberal maintenance,' yea, and 'wine' for their communions, and yet should gain well by it!"^c

Edwards deals so freely in questions and suppositions, he is so petulant, and dwells so mainly upon conjectural and hearsay grounds and charges; he so perpetually indulges in discussion quite intactible, and is moreover, so very discursive, that many of his pages in succession afford us no point or fact on which to settle. His examination, for instance, of the Apologists' "three great principles," as he phrases it, with a design "to discover to the Readers their weakness and defectiveness,"^d occupies thirty pages. "But," says he, "I intend a whole Tractate upon that question of the Scriptures, How far they are a rule for all matters of external government and order in the visible church?"^e So that what he writes in this, might have been referred to his own reconsideration in

^a "Proper, I say, and peculiar; amongst which I do not simply reckon the Hearing of the Word, . . . as being that in which no communion spiritual passeth, &c." See back, vol. i. p. 384.

^b P. 50, 51.

^c P. 56—58.

^d P. 68.

^e P. 73, and p. 77.

the intended work.^a Here, however, we find him venturing thus far, "This foolish imitation of the Apostles in all things of external order, hath been and is the great foundation of evils on all hands; both in many practices and points of popery, and amongst the anabaptists."^b The fitness of the leading epithet in this passage could not have been attempted to be supported but by an opponent determined to confute by overstraining.

In another place, he asserts, "You shall find that in the 'superstruc-tories' of the government of the church, there are but few particulars laid down in the pattern and example of the primitive churches. And those primitive practices are not such a rule given by God in matters of that nature as that all things then practised must be so in all after times, or that nothing afterwards might be practised but what is found there. . . For that is comeliness and reverence in one country which is not in another. So that any observation of so few particular 'superstruc-tories' recorded in the primitive churches,—namely, of common, ordinary, perpetual order, with the different practices, in the several churches recorded in the New Testament, and sometimes in the same church, in many things of the outward administration of external order, are sound proofs to me there are not rules, nor ruled cases, for many 'superstruc-tories' in external government."^c We set against this paragraph, the following extract from a modern writer, leaving at large the consideration on which side the argument is the safer.—"The sufficiency of the Bible, as a rule of faith and practice, is to be considered exclusive, not of other means of rational guidance, but of all other sources of authority in matters of religious duty. It is not implied, that nothing but what Scripture commands is lawful, but that nothing which Scripture has not made to be duty, can, as respects the concerns of religion, be constituted our duty by the authority of man. The Word of God is our only rule, in the sense both of a law and a standard; a rule sufficient, as opposed to all deficiency; exclusive, as relates to the Divine authority from which it emanates; universal, as embracing all the principles of human actions; and ultimate, as admitting of no appeal. For all religious purposes, it is literally the only rule, because the Divine command constitutes the only reason as well as the only law of religious actions; and there can, therefore, be no scope for other rules, except with regard to the mere outward circumstantial of religious duties, which do not come within the obligations of any law."^d

The next place at which we stop is where Edwards remarks, "As for your calling human prudence 'the fatal error to Reformation,' I judge that the want of it, in reformation, hath still proved 'fatal;' as amongst the Anabaptists, Brownists, and in New England also, till 'human prudence' eked out what was defective, in the way of their gathering at the first; and till 'human prudence' punished by banishment and imprisonment,—under the names of disturbers of the Civil peace,—many members of their churches, for Familism, Anabaptism, etc.; without which courses, and others of the like kind, their churches and common-

^a He published, in 1647, "The Particular Visibility of the Church."

^b P. 77.

^c P. 81.

^d "On Protestant Nonconformity; by Josiah Conder, 1818." 8vo. vol. ii. p. 318.

wealth had been long ago ruined." He reminds the Apologists of their having called this Assembly of Divines the "way of God, wisely assumed by the 'prudence' of the State;"^a and he goes on to say, "I suppose you call it not the 'way of God' as holding there is a clear resolution from Scripture, in any apostolical primitive pattern of the churches erected by the apostles, of an 'Assembly' so chosen by the magistrates, to draw up a government and direction in Worship for so many churches,—many of which churches have not so much as any one of their members there,—but only a 'way of God' according to general rules of 'prudence,' and so, 'wisely assumed' by the Parliament; and yet I hope you and your party will not afterwards, if the 'Assembly' should determine against Independency, style that 'the fatal error to Reformation!' But, however, we gain thus much from your being 'Members of the Assembly,' voting in it, and calling yourselves by that name—namely, a 'clear' answer that 'human prudence' is not always a 'fatal error to Reformation;' and, that a man needs not always 'suspend' his practice, though he have not 'a clear resolution' of example and direction from the primitive churches: witness, the acceptance of your being chosen to the 'Assembly.'"^b We have inserted these remarks to show with what smartness at least their author can occasionally play upon the slips and inadvertencies of the objects of his attack. The danger likely to result from 'human prudence' being applied incidentally,—for that is the Apologists' argument,—'in matters Divine,' is nevertheless nowise diminished by Edwards's special-pleading adroitness.

A long space occurs now in which there is little else than disputative matter about alleged dissensions among the Apologists themselves, and between them and other parties, when abroad, together with several applications of the *argumentum ad hominem*; but all as void of interest, at present, as of point. Edwards must have thought that he had damaged the reputation of the Apologists by what he represents them to have been concerned in when they were out of England; and he used his utmost skill to bring them into further disrepute for what he represents them to be aiming at since their return. Thus he writes, "Having apologized for yourselves and way in your principles, opinions, practices and carriage towards all sorts both before your exile and in your exile, here you come to apologize for yourselves, and for what you have done since your coming back into England, both before the 'Assembly' and since the 'Assembly,' until the time of putting forth this present 'Apologetical Narration.' But, Brethren, why do you, in the beginning of this part of your Apology, give yourselves that name of 'God's poor Exiles?' Was it not enough to have said, 'when it pleased God to bring us back again' into our own Land; but you must call yourselves 'God's Exiles,' and 'poor Exiles?' I wonder you termed not yourselves 'poor pilgrims!' But the reason why you name yourselves so here, and in this Apology take occasion so often to speak of exile and banishment, may easily be guest at; namely, to commend your persons and way the more to the People; and, for want of better, to take them

^a Ap. Nar. p. 28.

^b P. 83, 84.

with such popular arguments as suffering a grievous exile! Thus in many other passages of your Apology, you bring in, and insert, many such kind of phrases, to work with the People the more; but do insinuate many things against the Presbyterian way,—as of ‘engagements,’ ‘public interest,’ etc. . . . You can in no sense be called ‘poor Exiles,’ for you were rich Exiles, who, in Holland, enjoyed many conveniences and such abundance as to be able, some of you, to spend two or three hundred pounds, *per annum*, and to do other expensive acts which, for the present, I forbear to name.”^a

“As for those words, God’s bringing you ‘back again in these revolutions of the times’ into your own Land; I know God permitted it and ordered it. But I well know Satan hastened and furthered it, for the dividing of the godly party here; and for the obstructing the work of Reformation, and hindering the settling the government of the Church; that so, in the mean time, he might increase his kingdom and bring in a flood of all errors and licentiousness upon us. And, Brethren, let me speak sadly to you,—not of passion, but out of long and serious deliberation,—it had been good for you, and for us, that you had continued ‘exiles’ still; and that neither you Five, nor they of New England, had heard of the revolution of our times, and God’s visiting us in mercy, till the Church and Government had been settled. I am confident that things had not then been at that pass now as they are.”^b “As for your finding ‘the judgment’ of many of your godly, learned brethren in the ministry . . . ‘to differ’ from yours ‘in some things;’ that was no marvel! I wonder you could expect otherwise, being but a few young men of yesterday, and going a way by yourselves so different from all Reformed Churches. But I must tell you, you found not only the judgment of many godly ministers ‘that desired a general reformation,’ but the judgment of them all who were in public employment and of any great account, ‘to differ’ from yours; not only in ‘some’ things, but even in your whole church way: however, that since, by your presence and your politic way of working, and the strong stream of popular applause running that way, some few ministers, uncertain, heady, inconstant, wanton-witted men, are since come off to your way!”^c Whatever those “few” ministers might once have thought of their *quondam* friend, possibly they might now feel his lavish censure to be their greatest praise.

Edwards was, indeed, no niggard at abuse; and though the Apologists might not have feared his wrath, neither would they have coveted his applause. “As for the ‘calumnies’ cast upon you of ‘Schisms, Independency, and Brownism;’ . . . however you do, in words, wash your hands of these imputations, and wipe your mouths confidently denying them, yet all the water in the Thames will not wash you from all just imputation of these. . . . The old Separatists could not endure to be called ‘Brownists,’ or ‘Barrowists;’ so you will not endure the titles of ‘Schism, Separation, Independency,’ but you call it the ‘Congregational government,’ and ‘the church-way,’ and ‘an entire, full, complete power;’ but by no means ‘Independent government;’ that will not be endured!”^d “This ‘Independency’ and ‘Independent government,’ was a name of

^a P. 189—191.^b P. 191.^c P. 192.^d P. 197, 193.

your own giving ; and sure, I and others might lawfully call the child by the name the father and friends gave it ? To speak nothing of the name of 'Independent government' given to particular congregations, in many books of the total Separatists, maintaining it formally in those words ; it will be found in many printed books and manuscripts written by many men of your way and communion,—namely, of the 'middle way' as you call it...Amongst others, you shall find it in...a manuscript intituled 'A Treatise about a Church,' going under one of your names, [which] speaks often of 'Independent power,' and 'Independent government.' Besides, 'Independent government' hath been preached for at Margaret's Church in Westminster, and the city of London, in those words ; so that I wonder how you dare make such a flourish."^a "However that you disclaim the title here, and in other pages, yet you acknowledge the thing abundantly in the book ; namely, 'a full and entire power, complete within yourselves, until you be challenged to err grossly.'"^b As for civil power, it is not the question in controversy, neither was it affixt unto you ; and for spiritual power, properly called, you deny it all along, speaking against 'authoritative power' often."^d

"Brownism hath not been fastened on you by any, that I know ; but, on the contrary, you have been commonly contradistinguished from them, being called 'Independents,' 'Semi-Separatists ;'... but yet for all that, I cannot justly free yourselves from the 'odious name of Brownism' in most of the fundamental principles and practices of your churches ; no, not with all your artifices and specious pretences. As the Brownists growing up and out of the Anabaptists, did refine and qualify anabaptism in many things, in government, prophesying, etc. ; so have you refined and qualified Brownism from the grossness and rigidness of it as it was held by the first fathers and authors of it."^e "May I guess at the chief and fundamental point of all church government and discipline, wherein you declared your judgments by which you would distinguish yourselves from the Brownists ? Is it not, that you give the power and authority to the Officers, and not to the People only ? I have heard that of late you have declared yourselves thus ; and the late Epistle before Mr. Cotton's book,^f written by two of you, implies so much... Yet this will not free you, for Mr. Johnson fell to this, and yet was guilty of Brownism."^g "And as for the way of your expression, of 'Presbyterial government,' I cannot but except at it ; observing that, all along, obliquely and as far as you may, you still asperse that. You can here express 'Brownism' simply, without any additions to it ; but you cannot pass by 'Presbyterial government' without a lash at it, 'which is the contention of these times !' As if you would insinuate the blame of all the contentions and stir of these times to be Presbyterial government ; whereas the truth is 'the contention of these times' is Episcopal, and your Independent government, which have caused and do continue all the contention and stirs in church and commonwealth, they mutually strengthening each other against Presbyterial government."^h What shall

^a P. 201.^b Ap. Nar. p. 14.^c *Ib.* p. 15, 18, 19.^d P. 202, 203.^e P. 204.^f "The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." See back, p. 259.^g P. 206.^h P. 207.

henceforward be said, after all the mass of contumely which has been heaped upon them by the ungrateful children of that very Church of England, which it is seen was willing for her support, to cling to these despised Independents? We can easily perceive why the latter would prefer to even uphold a tyranny they had known and endured, before another which they foresaw would endeavour to crush them with a still more accumulated weight of intolerance; and it is no less easily discernible that it could not have been the Independents who wrought the overthrow of Episcopacy; this most bitter of the bitter among our enemies being himself a witness. Thus far, at least, our predecessors stand cleared of what the ingrates so unjustly continue to ascribe to them; for we are able to say to our modern accusers, with effect, "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder!"^a

Well, let us see what Edwards has to say in the character of a self-constituted "witness" upon a point in which he solemnly affirms that he should "sin against God and the truth," if he should not "speak the truth, and the whole truth," with this qualification, however, "so far as I know, and have been, from good hands, informed;"—hearsay evidence again,—but he proceeds, "All of you have not constantly forborne 'to publish' your 'opinions, by preaching;' but you have vented your principles and opinions by preaching sometimes more generally and covertly,—yet so as your followers understand you,—and sometimes particularly and plainly. In a more general and covert way, you have done it often, under preaching for 'purity of Ordinances;' the 'standing for the kingly office of Christ;' the 'being in a Church way;' the 'performing of all the ordinances in the due and right order,' etc. Wherein you do for your way just as the Malignant Ministers preach against the Parliament and for the Cavaliers, under generalities, by preaching against 'rebellion' and 'fighting against the king,' and 'rising against him,' and 'for peace,' etc.; which the Malignants understand well enough, and flock to them upon it."^b "As for Mr. Nye, he having lived a great part of his time since his return into England, in Noblemen's families, and in Yorkshire, and having preached little in the parishes here in London, I cannot prove that he hath published his 'opinions,' by 'preaching' particularly for them. But, whether Mr. Nye hath not acted the State-parasite, and played the politician, the more; and dealing in private underhand, and hand to hand with some men of note for the church way, and against the government of the Church of Scotland; and particularly at Hull,—as I have some ground for what I write,—so I appeal to his conscience, and entreat him to rub up his memory whom he hath conferred with about these points."^c With such dark and insidious imputations as Edwards indulges in, we are not called upon to deal; but wherein Nye might have been called upon to plead or interpose for liberty of either kind, civil or religious, we venerate him as we do all his compatriots.

Again: "All of you have not forborne 'to print anything' of your 'own' for your opinions and ways;.. as is to be seen in Mr. Bur-

^a Acts xiii. 41.^b P. 215.^c P. 217.

roughe's Exposition,^a and in Mr. Simpson's sermons called Reformation's Preservation,^b and in Mr. Bridge's sermon called Babylon's Downfal.^c But, supposing you had wholly forborne printing anything of your 'own,' you might well have done it out of policy, and yet your way not have suffered by it: so many books and little pamphlets having been printed and reprinted since this Parliament for the church-way, as amounts to the number, I think, of almost one hundred! And I ask of you, Whether one or more of you have not had a hand in perusing and examining some books of others, or in counselling and consenting to the printing of them? Especially some books from out of New England, and particularly of Mr. Cotton's."^d

"If you have not 'acted' for yourselves and way, since your returns into England; and improved your time well too, most who know you are much deceived in you, and strangely mistaken. And suffer me to deal plainly with you; I am persuaded that, setting aside the Jesuits 'acting' for themselves and way, you Five have 'acted' for yourselves and way, both by yourselves and by your instruments, both upon the stage and behind the curtain,—considering circumstances, and laying all things together,—more than any five men have done in so short a time this sixty years. And if it be not so, whence have come all the swarms and troops of Independents in ministry, armies, city, country, gentry; and amongst the common people of all sorts, men, women, servants, children? Have not you Five had the greatest influence to cause this? Who [else] have wrought so many ministers, gentlemen, and people, to your way? Can it be in reason thought all this is come about without your 'acting' for yourselves and way? Is the people's 'golden calf' of Independency and Democracy come out of itself, without Aaron's making it?"^e

"Have you not been, all along, from your first coming over into England, to the writing of this present Apology, intent and watchful upon everything in agitation, or about to pass in matters of religion, that might make, though but remotely, for Presbyterial government; and might, though but by a remote consequence, and at a distance, touch upon or prejudice your church way? As, for instance, about the time of passing a Bill in the House of Commons, against Episcopacy, and of consultation and debate what should be in the interim, till another government could be settled; were not you zealous and 'active' against that advice and counsel,—of a certain number of grave ministers in each county to be substituted for the time,—out of your fear of having but a shadow of Presbyterian government, though but *pro tempore*? And how much you worked in that, with some of place, and what the issue of that was, you may remember. So, upon thoughts and consultations, since this War, of entering into a Covenant; and some ministers being advised with, Whether did not some of you stand for a clause to be inserted in the Covenant for liberty to tender con-

^a On Hosea, Lect. i. p. 224, 225; vii. p. 173; v. p. 134, 141; iii. p. 288; xiii.; and in many other places.

^b On Isai. iv. 5, last clause; and Prov. viii. 15, 16.

^c And that on Zech. i. 18, 21.

^d P. 220.

^e P. 221. (Exod. xxxii. 24.)

sciences? And, for want of such a clause; that being opposed by some; how long it was laid aside, and so forth, I desire you to remember. Again; about the beginning of the Assembly, in the review and examination of some of the Articles of Religion, and in the propounding but some Orders to have been agreed on about the way of managing the disputes and debates in the Assembly; how tender have you been of anything tending but to Presbytery, and that might, though but indirectly, reflect upon any of your principles!"^a

"And whereas Mr. Simpson was a minister of a church at Rotterdam, which church is still there, hath not Mr. Simpson since his return well 'acted' for himself and his way in getting such a rich and numerous church, consisting of so many gentlemen and gentlewomen, rich citizens, rich virgins, etc.? And hath not Mr. Goodwin 'acted' for himself and way, and at the least, 'in the least attempted' to 'increase a party,' when, besides those of his church at Arnheim that came over from thence, there are others here in London have gone to his church-meetings? And there are some, if not actually members,—the ceremony, may be, being forborne, that it may be said he hath added none to his church,—yet are *competentes candidati*, probationers, members *in fieri*, with their faces to Zion!"^b

"And out of zeal of 'acting' for yourselves and way, have not some of you suggested, in private, to Parliament-men, the prejudice of their Parliamentary power if they should admit of the government of the Church of Scotland; pleading also for a necessity of a toleration? And, in particular, I ask Mr. Nye, if he remember no such discourses, and that at Hull too?"^c We see now the amount of the mysterious accusation against Nye, recorded in a foregoing extract from Edwards.^d

"Whether have not you, out of 'acting' for yourselves and way, had many meetings and consultations both of writing Letters into New England for their help and furtherance, and about what you should do, and how to order matters since the Scots must be sent for? And, since the Assembly could not be hindered, how they must be managed and carried for the best advantage of your cause and way? And whether was not this 'Apologetical Narration' one of the products of your consultations?"^e

These, and other queries of less apparent interest, Edwards propounded with the design of concluding the whole in that where he puts it to the Apologists, if they could imagine "that all had been forgotten" which they had "done and preached?"^f Still he did not stop even here, for he presently continues, "But supposing all you affirm of yourselves had been true, *cujus contrarium verum est*, as is too evident by what I have proved!—that you had neither preached, printed, nor acted, personally for yourselves and way, yet all this forbearance might have been not from the grounds and reasons brought by you, but from other

^a P. 222.^b P. 222.^c P. 223.—A curious account of an "Agreement" among the London ministers "for common ends," against the Hierarchy, is contained in this work of Edwards', p. 239—243; and which Nye is there charged with having abducted from Mr. Calamy's possession.^d Under p. 217.^e P. 224.^f P. 224.

principles of wisdom and policy ;” which Edwards sums up thus, “ not to ‘act’ so much as your fellows, and not so openly as otherwise you would ; especially knowing whilst you were in the tiring-house unseen, the scene was full, and the tragedy went on, there being no want of actors on the open stage to carry on your church-way ; of whose preachings, and acting for themselves and way in gathering of churches, etc., and of books made by some of them and printed by others of them, it would fill a book to enumerate particulars.”^a

How much the working of Edwards’s party is betrayed in what is gathered from his next two pages, these sentences alone will show : “ The ministers courted you by all ways of respect, and of high entertainment of you in loving speech, friendly countenance, familiar conversing with you, giving you the right hand of fellowship, and in a brotherly entreating you not to appear for your ‘way ;’ that so our differences might not hinder the work of Reformation : withal promising you, When they had obtained the Reformation desired they should be ready to gratify you all they could, and to consider you as Godly Brethren.” Doubtless, the Apologists had penetration enough to discern what “could” and would be done for their gratification ! But Edwards says further, “ There hath been much tenderness expressed towards you, and readiness of yielding to you all along ; the more to win you, to prevent an open breach, and to stop people’s mouths . . . And I may truly speak it, many of our ministers have not carried themselves towards one another with that love and respect as they have done to you.”^b

Consciousness, perhaps, induced Edwards, at this stage of his progress in this treatise, to take to himself what seems to an ordinary reader to have a wider application. Here, then, he writes, “ For the ‘incitements to this State’ not to allow you ‘the peaceable practices’ of your consciences ; . . . edged with calumnies and reproaches cast upon your persons ‘in print ;’ I suppose you mean that book written by me ;^c for as for any other book of that nature I remember none : besides, you commend the other books^d written against your way and tenets.” After showing some degree of mortification that the Apologists by their “silence” seem “to give consent” to what he had written against them ; and claiming their thanks, forsooth, for having “chalked out a way”^e by which they might be “allowed” the “peaceable practice” of their consciences ; he writes, “ As for my ‘incitement to the State,’ it was not to persecution against you, for I laid down a clear medium^f between persecution and a toleration.” And he adds here, “ The Reformed Churches abroad might more safely allow you the liberty of your consciences there, than this State can ;” for, he tells them, “ in England, you Independents will look for the like privileges that others enjoy ; as, to be mayors of towns, chosen burgesses and knights for Parliament, etc. Whereby you will have a mighty influence and advantage to countenance and promote your way, and to make parties everywhere ;

^a “ As for instance, Mr. W. : P. : B. : K. : Dr. H. : Mr. L. : G. : C. : B. : P. : G. : W. : W. S. : C. : E. : C. : A. : L. : *cum multis aliis.*”—P. 225.

^b P. 226, 227.

^c “ Reasons against the Independent Government, &c.” See back, p. 100.

^d Ap. Nar. p. 15.

^e In p. 43—45.

^f P. 42.

which must needs be of dangerous consequence to this State!"^a We disavow any such inference, unless by the "State," Edwards means "Presbyterial government," and its preservation at the expense of the sacrifice of other men's "consciences;" which we think he must have meant, and so found it expedient to practise an old saw which he had charged upon the Apologists, "like the lapwing, to cry furthest off the nest."^b That we are not wrong in our conjecture, we gather from his own words a few pages onward, where he writes, "We who have written anything against your way, have not so much 'prepossessed the people's minds' against your 'tenets,' as laboured to dispossess them. We have played the after game too much, you the fore game."^c And again: "It would grieve an ingenuous and conscientious man"—mark, a "conscientious man"—"to see wherever one comes, how many good people of the kingdom are 'prepossessed' by being prejudiced against Presbyterial government, That it will be worse than the Hierarchy, and more tyrannical to the consciences and liberties of the People: with such like. There was, therefore, and is, much need to cast out these Devils, and to unpossess the people possessed!" His lamentations are not yet exhausted, for he goes on, "such is the nature of your errors, that hitherto few who take hold of them ever return;" and a pun is emitted with the last sigh, "like 'Goodwin' sands, that if a ship once strike upon them, there is no fetching her off!"^d

These incorrigible Apologists had yet more vituperation to undergo, though with an infusion of something of another quality, "Whence," he asks now, "have come all the rents and divisions, to speak of, in the godly Protestant party; all the lets, stops, and delays, in the intended Reformation; but from you, and by occasion and means of you? The authority of your names, holding these opinions,—having the reputation of scholars, and of excellent preachers,—whereby you are cried up of many and so much followed; your interest and favour in too many considerable persons, have drawn so much, [that] had it not been for your sakes, these rents and divisions had never come to this head! There had not been that connivance; nor such delays of settling government, etc. Most of the rest of your way were, in comparison, contemptible both for name and gifts, and could not have done that hurt."^e

"Why were you not contented with the giving of the first 'blow,' and the first occasion of the quarrel, both by your former preaching and practising, but to add this 'second' great 'blow,' the writing of this 'Apologetical Narration;' which, though it be not on your parts the beginning of strife, yet it will prove as the breaking in of waters, and as the kindling of a fire not likely to be put out in haste."^f

"The Assembly being upon the very borders of the points in difference, . . . this 'Apology' was made for want of patience to wait, and out of that common design of 'acting' for yourselves and way, and to lay in something beforehand with the Parliament and the People; whatever the Assembly might chance to conclude: in a word, to play the foregame, and to prepossess the minds of men with a further high

^a P. 228.^b P. 212.^c P. 233.^d P. 234.^e P. 235.^f P. 236.

opinion of you and your way. But I believe God hath turned all to the contrary, taking 'the wise in their own craftiness;' ^a and this 'Apology' hath and will make more against you than any one thing you ever did!" ^b
 "So soon as ever I read it over with deliberation I presently apprehended it the beginning of your fall, in regard of your church way... I believe this 'Apology,' considering all circumstances, was born and brought forth the most out of due time and order of any book put forth this forty years." ^c

"I cannot let pass, without some animadversions, the phrase used by you, of your being Members of the Assembly, 'We have adventured ourselves:' a very significant and true expression. For I believe you account this Assembly a great 'adventure' for your church way; and such a bottom as you would not have put it in, at least not so soon if all the ways you could have devised under heaven would have hindered it. But it happened to you according to the proverb, 'Nothing venture, nothing have;' for, supposing there must be an Assembly, you might perhaps, by being 'Members' of it, do yourselves and way some good; but by declining and refusing it, you had been certainly lost!" ^d

We are indebted to Edwards for his testimony concerning one memorable circumstance in English history, from which it will be seen that Independents had no share in promoting that measure. He tells us that "The Parliament of England, upon great armies being raised against them, needing helps, calls for the kingdom of Scotland to assist them. Now, the Scots being for Presbyterial government, and against Independent; and desirous of uniformity in government between the kingdoms; therefore, for gratifying the Scots, the Assembly is like to be swayed that way! Is this 'the stream of public interest' meant by you? Oh, how unworthy an insinuation is this! And how prejudicial this will be to the Reformation in after times, I desire you to consider of in cool blood; and, what the enemies will say of it. The government and Reformation of this church was not free; not according to the Word of God; but, what Scotland would have, England's need of Scotland made them at least swayed much to take up their government! But however this is insinuated, for the holding up the credit of your Cause against the time the Assembly shall come to reject it as apocryphal, yet I must tell you [that] you 'foresaw' that, which is no such 'stream of public interest,' nor cause of disadvantage to you. For the Commissioners of the Church of Scotland were not sent hither to put their government upon us; but came as well to receive any light and help, as to give; and to come to us, in what should be found, upon debate, more agreeable to the Word, as we to come to them. And the Covenant of the kingdoms doth not tie us to the Reformation of the Church of Scotland, but binds us to Reformation according to the Word of God and the example of the best Reformed Churches; and then requires both of us and them a Uniformity 'according to the Word of God.'... Besides that, the Commissioners of the Church of Scotland, however they be present in the Assembly to hear debates, and to give their rea-

^a Job v. 13.^b P. 246.^c P. 247, 248.^d P. 254

sons, yet never gave their voices in any point that hath passed the Assembly." ^a

"Brethren, there are many complaints, and that by your dear friends, of retarding the work of Reformation by your means. You are the *remora* to the ship under sails; you are the spokes in the wheels of the chariot of Reformation! Parliament complains; Assembly, city, country, all complain of the work retarded, and all is resolved into you Five principally. I could tell you many particular passages, but you know what I mean. In a word, all the prelates and the papists cannot, nor do not so much hinder the work of Reformation as you Five Members of the Assembly. And the Lord, in mercy, work so, that by occasion of you, and by means of your principles, and many persons of your church way, there do not yet rise up another 'great mountain' before Zerubbabel,^b to hinder the laying the 'headstone' of that building the foundation whereof is laid."^c

"To speak truth, you were so much the People's darlings and favourites, having such a power both with the People and with many in Place, that not to oppose or 'reproach' your persons, but your opinions, and that collaterally and interpretatively, was enough to unsaint many men as 'good' as yourselves, and to blast them with many, for the present."^d "Besides our 'reproaches during the time of your exile in Holland, we have, since your return from exile, even to this present day, suffered many 'reproaches,' and lost all manner of ways—in name, estate, and friends—for nothing else but for appearing against the Brownists and Independents; and how much, in the mean time, most of you have gained all manner of ways, is written with a sunbeam!"^e "Can any who know you, in what height you live, and what Grandees of the times you are; and how much you appear in public in the chief places of resort, and have insinuated into so many great men; believe that you would live contented with a subsistence, 'be it the poorest and meanest?' Let them believe you that will! For my part, I am not satisfied in the truth of it, but do suspect that if the Parliament should make an offer to you to this purpose, [whether] you would refuse it."^f

"There will be objected, a passage lately printed in a book of Mr. Simpson's, that 'There have been as great defections both of ministers and people unto errors under Presbyterial government as under any other. As is clear in the Low Countries, where so many ministers and people turned Arminians, Papists, Socinians.'^g Though the churches in the Low Countries are Presbyterial, yet withal there is a Toleration of other churches and government there; which is one of the causes of it, and hinders Presbyterial government! A Toleration will spoil any church and government. If Presbyterial government be settled, and a Toleration given in this Land, that will mar all. So that the Parliament may be pleased to take notice by this, and observe the difference between those churches which have no Tolerations, as Scotland, Geneva, and the Low Countries which grants a Toleration; the one are pure in doctrine, etc.; the other, makes 'ministers and people' turn Arminians,

P. 259, 260.

^b Zech. iv. 7.^c P. 269.^d P. 273.

P. 274

^f P 276.^g "The Anatomist Anatomised," p. 10.

Socinians, etc. ! There is another reason why it may so fall out in the Low Countries ; because Presbyterial government hath not its free course there in Synods, but it is much disturbed over [what] it is in France, Geneva, Scotland. Whereas by the Canons and Constitutions in the Netherlands, there should be a National Synod once in three years, they have not, nor can procure one in twenty years and upwards. And whereas Provincial Synods should be yearly, they have them in some Provinces but once in five, and seven, years. Besides, there are other disturbances in Presbyterial government, which hinder the free course of it in Holland : many encroachments are made upon the rights of their Church, due to them by virtue of their Discipline, and therefore established. In a word, that Anabaptistical and Familistical spirit in many ; and the corrupt spirit and principles in others ; with those principles of Toleration ; do much check and stop Presbyterial government from having its perfect work, and bringing forth its full effects." ^a

To ward off what Edwards so deeply deplores and deprecates, near "the close" of his "discourse" he writes, "I humbly beseech the Parliament seriously to consider the depths of Satan in this design of a Toleration : how this is now the last plot and design ; and by it would undermine and frustrate the whole work of Reformation intended. It is his masterpiece for England ; and for the effecting of it, he comes and moves, not in Prelates and Bishops, not in furious Anabaptists, etc., but in holy men, excellent preachers, moderate and fair men, not for a Toleration of heresies and gross offences, but an 'allowance of a latitude to some lesser differences with peaceableness ;' this is *candidus ille Diabolus*, as Luther speaks ; and *meridianus Diabolus*, as Johannes Gersonius and Beza express it ; 'coming under the merits of much suffering and well deserving, clad in the white garments of innocence and holiness.' " ^b In a word, could the Devil effect a Toleration, he would think he had gained well by the Reformation, and made a good exchange of the Hierarchy to have a Toleration for it !" ^c

In the practical application of his "discourse," Edwards says, "I shall conclude this Antapology with turning myself to the Apologists. —Brethren, I beseech and exhort you to search and try your hearts and ways, both in what may be precedent to this 'Apology,' and with what spirit and intentions you writ it ; that God should thus leave you to yourselves to make such an 'Apology !' Let your consciences reflect upon what is plainly laid down in this Answer, and do not seek shifts and subterfuges. Consider there is a special hand of God in it ; and [that] it is not ordinary that both so many public and particular persons should appear in writing against a book, as have done against yours : the Churches beyond the seas ; the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland ; with three distinct Answers made by particular persons ; besides, I hear another Answer is coming forth. Certainly, the Lord left you, to humble you ; and that you might know what was in your hearts. Your great applause and being cried up by the People ; your favour and power with many great

^a 298.^b Luther, in Loc. Comm. class. v. p. 24.^c P. 303.

persons; your great estates and abundance; your confidence of carrying anything, and saying anything; your wisdom and great parts, were too strong for you, and deceived you. Let my counsel be acceptable to you: repent, repent of writing this 'Apology;' give glory to God, and recant; and testify your repentance by dissolving your churches and coming in to us!"^a

CHAP. LV.

PRYNNE AND BURTON, OPPONENTS.

It would seem to be barely credible, so few as they were ostensibly, that the Apologetical party should thus have risen into the notoriety they had already acquired. So soon does it appear truly, that by the obstacles they interposed, they were preventing their countrymen, all they could, from escaping only out of one species of intolerable bondage into another. That being so beset on either side, they were, however, ultimately driven to measures which cannot be fully vindicated, was more the fault of their condition than of their intention; which, carried out faithfully, and unalloyed with the interference of civil authority, was calculated to secure to all alike, that most equitable principle by which all degrees of all classes can alone "stand fast" in the "liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."^b The peculiarity of the opposition they had to endure may be judged of, in one instance, from "Twelve Considerable Serious Questions, Touching Church Government: Sadly propounded,—out of a real Desire of Unity and Tranquillity in Church and State,—to all Sober-minded Christians, cordially affecting a speedy Settled Reformation and Brotherly Christian Union in all our Churches and Dominions, now miserably wasted with Civil unnatural Wars, and deplorably lacerated with Ecclesiastical Dissensions.—By William Prynne, of Lincoln's Inn, Esq.—1644." 4to. pp. 8.

That this production was designed to serve a party, more than to serve Gospel Truth, will appear from the extreme positions which it advocates. Our own purpose in noticing Prynne's work, will be accomplished in what we shall produce in connexion with "A Vindication of Churches commonly called 'Independent:' Or a Brief Answer to two Books; the one intituled 'Twelve Considerable Serious Questions, Touching Church Government:' the other, 'Independency examined, unmasked, refuted, etc.:' both, lately published by William Prynne, of Lincoln's Inn, Esq.—By Henry Burton, a Brother of his, and late Companion in Tribulation.—1644." 4to. pp. 72.

After having recited from Prynne's title before the "Questions" the description of those particularly addressed, Burton tells him, in an Epistle, "Myself being one of these... do, with the right-hand, take your propositions as made to me among the rest, craving your leave to return you a brotherly answer; and brotherly in nothing more than by

^a P. 305.

^b Gal. v. 1.

a candid and christian dealing with you all along, and that also in a matter of such high moment as concerns the 'kingdom' and glory of Jesus Christ. The zeal whereof, is that alone which puts me upon this task; it being far beyond my thoughts that you and I, having been fellow-sufferers, and spectacles to the world, upon that tragical stage of antichristian tyranny, should ever come upon the theatre as antagonists, one against the other!... And had not the book had your name in the front, my stomach had not stooped so low as to take it up or down: but because most men are apt to take all upon trust where they find Mr. Prynne's name engaged; and the Cause being so precious as it hath, by right, taken up my whole heart to become an advocate to plead the excellency of it; I could not, though the meanest of all, but for the love of Christ constraining me, and by his grace assisting, undertake this task: otherwise unwilling *in hoc ulcere esse unguis*, as the Roman orator said in another case. And this Answer was brought to the birth soon after yours; but it wanted a midwife, whereof you have plenty; and I have had many interruptions: nor am I so quick of foot as you; but I may say as Jerome once, to young Augustine, 'Bos lassus fortius figit pedem;' and so, in the spirit of love, I come to your book."

Burton commences by saying, "You are for a 'speedy accomplishment' of a Reformation;^a and so am I. And so our late Covenant taken, binds every man to begin with himself, and those under him; and each to prevent other in the work. But yet this is sooner said than done: for, 'shall a Nation be born at once?'^b Shall a corrupt, profane, polluted land, not yet washed from her old superstitions; not yet weaned from the Egyptian 'flesh pots';^c not yet wrought off from the spirit of bondage; become, all on a sudden, a reformed nation? But yet, 'optandum est ut fiat, conandum est ut fiat,' to use Augustine's words, of the conversion of the Jews; 'it were to be wished, and should be endeavoured:' but as Rome was not built in one day, nor 'the mystery of iniquity' perfected in one day; so neither can Rome be so easily pulled down in one day, nor can England become a Mount Sion in one day! First, the old rubbish will require some time to be removed out of your church-walls; but how much longer time, out of men's hearts where they have [it hath] been so long, so fast, incorporated!... England is generally ignorant of the mystery of Christ's Kingdom; the prelates usurped all, suppressed altogether, this spiritual Kingdom: no ministers durst so much as mutter a word of it. Who durst say that men's consciences are subject to none but Christ? That Christ is the only Lawgiver of his church? That the churches of Christ ought not to be burdened with any human ordinances:... that all rites and ceremonies invented by men, and imposed on men, in God's service, are all a 'will-worship,' condemned by the apostle?^d and the like. And yet we deny not, that every member in a church is to be subject to the officers thereof holding out the Word, for conscience' sake...^e A Reformation, therefore, such as God requires, will necessarily require longer time yet, that we may not go blindfolded about it. . .

"Had I been accounted worthy to be reckoned among those 'reverend

^a Prynne, p. 2.

^b Isai. lxvi. 8.

^c Exod. xvi. 3.

^d Col. ii. 23.

^e Heb. xiii. 17.

friends,'—to have been made acquainted with such a purpose,—I should have used all 'importunity' seasoned with strong reasons, to have dissuaded you from those 'subitane apprehensions.'—And seeing I come to know them, though somewhat too late, . . . though I know you to be a very 'helluo librorum,'—of vast and indefatigable reading,—and to have a stomach proportionable, of a strong *digestion*; yet give me leave to tell you, as my loving and beloved friend and brother, that the subject you here deal with, is not of so easy a digestion, as that 'subitane,' or sudden, 'apprehensions' thereof may be well said to be digested!'.^a

"Passing along, Brother, I find your Questions turned into your own resolutions, so as, instead of *debating* them by 'sober-minded' men, you forestall them, and tell us that these 'Independents,' as you style them, 'are guilty of arrogancy, schism, contumacy; and liable to such

^a Prynne had opened his Questions thus: "Having neither leisure nor opportunity to debate the late unhappy differences sprung up amongst us touching Church-government; disputed at large by Mr. Herle, Dr. Stewart, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Dury, Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Simpson, and others; which much retard the speedy accomplishment and establishment of that happy Reformation we all earnestly pray for, and, at least pretend, cordially to desire, I have—at the importunity of some Reverend friends [!]^a—digested my subitane apprehensions of these distracting controversies into the ensuing Considerable Questions; which, sadly pondered and solidly debated by sober-minded, peaceably-disposed, men, of greater ability and vacancy for such a work, than I enjoy, may put a happy period to all our dissensions about this subject; and heartily unite our divided judgments [and] affections, the better to secure ourselves against the common enemies, who prevail most by our divisions."—Dury's tract intended, is probably, "An Epistolary Discourse, wherein, amongst other particulars, these following Questions are briefly resolved:—1. Whether or not, the State should tolerate the Independent Government? 2. If they should tolerate it; how far and with what limitations? 3. If they should not tolerate it; what course should be taken to bring them to a conformity with the Presbyterials?—Written by Mr. John Dury to Mr. Thomas Goodwin, Mr. Philip Nye, Mr. Samuel Hartlib. Published by a Friend, for more common use.—Julii 27, 1644. Imprimatur, James Cranford, 1644." 4to. pp. 41. This was followed by "Some few Considerations Propounded as so many Scruples by Mr. Henry Robinson, in a Letter to Mr. John Dury, upon his Epistolary Discourse. [London, Nov. 5, 1644. pp. 10.]" Being the first part of a pamphlet of forty-six pages, 4to., but all printed in 1646. It is not in our plan to give the particulars of the perhaps well-intended but certainly Utopian, pursuit of Dury, through a long course of years and with much employment of the press, to endeavour a pacification and agreement of all the Protestant Churches throughout the World, and during which pursuit he actually sustained in succession, in his own person, the respective ministries in Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and, according to Wood, Ath. Oxon, vol. ii. 4to. p. 420, Independent churches. We cannot but think, therefore, that though he temporarily staved off, as it were, the effects of the impressions produced by Robinson's "Scruples," yet their pungency was never allayed. See a curious paragraph respecting Dury, Scoticè "Durie," in Baillie's Letters, No. 50; to Spang, April 19, 1644. One of his pieces is, "A Model of Church Government: Or, The Grounds of the Spiritual Frame and Government of the House of God. Showing, What the Holy Scriptures have therein delivered; What the best Reformed Churches do practise; What the Tender Consciences may rest in. For the better Satisfaction of such as scruple at the Work of Reformation, declared and appointed by several Ordinances of Parliament. By John Dury, one of the Assembly of Divines; who hath travelled heretofore in the work of Peace among the Churches. 1647." 4to. pp. 56. On the first page of the Preface, he tells the Reader, "I think myself bound to declare this, That I am under a Vow to prosecute upon all occasions, as long as I live, the ways of evangelical reconciliation amongst Protestants." He seems to have died a "Quaker." Wood, *sup.* p. 421, note 10.

penalties as are due to these offences, in case they shall not submit to such a Public Church-government,—rites, discipline,—as a Synod and Parliament shall conceive most consonant to God's Word, etc.' And all along, your Queries are so 'digested' by you, as that they cast up a very ill scent, if not rather a judicial sentence, against those churches which, not *honoris causa*, you name 'Independents.' . . Thus much of your proem, or preface. . .

"Let me premise this, as an *αἴτημα* which I must demand of you as due to my profession, That forasmuch as you are a learned lawyer, and able to speak much of laws, and customs of nations and churches; and myself am a professor of divinity, the rules and principles whereof are all of them laid down in the Scriptures unto which, alone, all questions about faith and religion are so reducible, and finally determinable, as whoso denieth this, denieth the faith and is not to be disputed with, as a denier of principles; therefore I require of you as a christian brother, to join issue with me in this point, That all your questions may be resolved by clear Scriptures, and reason evidently deduced from them; and this, with all brevity and perspicuity.

"Now to your first question; the sum whereof is,

'Whether every several nation, republic, and national church, hath not, under the Gospel,^a a liberty and latitude left them to choose and settle such an orderly form of church-government, discipline, and ecclesiastical rites, as is most suitable to their particular Civil government, laws, manners, customs; . . being not repugnant to the Word of God? . . This being, as I conceive, a generally received truth among all Protestant churches.^b . . And, whether some things in all church governments,—discipline, ceremonies whatsoever,—are not and must not be left to human prudence; for which there is no direct precept, nor pattern, in sacred writ? Which truth, is assented to by all parties, churches, whatsoever, in theory or practice? . .'

"To your quotation [marginal note] of the Harmony, I will answer one for all. 'We condemn not traditions of holydays, of the *Lord's day*, of the nativity, of Easter, and the rest, for a politic end:'^c here, you see, they put the observation of the Lord's day among human 'traditions;' which, I suppose, you do not approve! Again; they allow only such observations [observances?] as God, 'by the moral law and the voice of nature itself, commandeth.'^d And, thirdly, 'That human rites be not imposed;' 'That men's consciences be not burdened.'^e And [now] in a word, to shape religion, in point of 'church-government, etc.,' to every 'nation, republic, etc.,' and so to 'human prudence,' as you say, what is it but to shape a coat for the moon? Whereas the Scriptures hold forth unto us but only one form of 'church government' and 'discipline,' which ought not to be altered according to the diversity of human laws and customs in all kingdoms and commonwealths, as you affirm. And whereas you make a proviso—'always provided'—every thing 'be consonant, and no way repugnant, to the Word of God;' to what purpose is this, when the very liberty you give of altering 'church-government'

^a 1 Cor. xiv. 40; xi. 34.

^b Harmony of Confessions. Sect. 10, 11, 26. [16, in Prynne:] ["The very substance of the 34th Article of the Church of England." *Ibid.*]

^c Sect. 16, August. Confessio 4. "Traditiones de feriis, &c."

^d Observationes brevissimæ in totam Harmoniam, Sect. 19.

^e "Ne conscientiæ onerentur." App. sect. 10.

and 'discipline' as may be 'suitable' to human laws and customs, is itself 'repugnant' and no way 'consonant' to the Word of God? as we shall show, by-and-by. This is 'to transform the church into a human polity;' 'these imaginations,' or fancies, 'have, in all ages from the beginning of the world, hurt the church, and will always hurt.'^a Thus the Harmony.^b

"Whereas you seem to challenge us 'infallibly' to evidence by any Gospel text, 'That Christ hath peremptorily prescribed one and the self-same form of ecclesiastical government, discipline, rites, to all nations, churches, in all particulars, from which they may, in no case, vary; under pain of mortal sin, schism, or being no true churches of Christ, with whom good Christians may not safely communicate:' first, What evidence, from Scripture, can you bring why it should not, necessarily, be so?"

"You would seem to make this a ground why 'church-government, etc.,' should be alterable, according to the several laws and customs of several nations; because, say you, 'Christ' enjoined the preaching of the Gospel, 'to all nations and people whatsoever, who have their several established different forms, etc.' By this reason[ing], you might argue, That therefore, the 'Gospel' itself may be preached variously, according to the variation of the climate!^c And if not so, then, say I, neither is the 'church-government, etc.,' to be varied according to the diversity of nations, laws, customs, climates: for the church government and discipline now, in the time of the Gospel, 'is a part of the Gospel';^d as being the Gospel-government and discipline of the evangelical churches. And, why should you think that Christ, now, 'under the Gospel,' or New Testament, hath left a greater 'liberty' to men to alter that form of church-government, etc., which, in the New Testament, is laid down, than he did, in the Old Testament, under the Levitical law?...^e But some will say, When the tribes of Israel were reduced under a kingly government, as in David's time, the service of God was in greater state and external pomp when the Temple was built than it was before in the Tabernacle: whereby it may appear that there was a liberty left to David to alter the form of worship so as was suitable to the regal state! But I answer, Here was no liberty left to man to alter anything in the worship of God, or in the church-government...^f And you know, it was never left to the kings of Judah to do the least thing in point of reformation, but only to see that the priests do all strictly,—not anything, as seemed good to them, but all,—according to the precise rule of the law, 2 Chron. xxxi. Now, was the Lawgiver so strict under the Old Testament, and is he grown more remiss under the New?—In Ezekiel's vision of the temple, or church in the time of the Gospel, chap. xliii. 10, 11, we read of a 'pattern, form, fashion,' of every par-

^a Vide Appendices locorum.

^b "See also, the close of Gualter's Homilies, in the Acts."

^c "Not but that we grant a variety in the method and manner in point of circumstance, so [that] the substance be kept; as repentance from dead works, and faith towards our Saviour Jesus Christ: so [too] in church-government." Marg.

^d See this position remarked upon, in R. Hooker's Eccles. Polity. Bk. III. sec. 3, 10.

^e Exod. xxv. 40; Heb. viii. 5.

^f 1 Chron. xxviii. 19.

particular thing. . .—Or, are men more wise and more faithful now than David was, that Christ should trust every nation with such a ‘liberty’ as this, To alter and diversify church-government, etc., so as might be most agreeable to this or that kingdom’s, commonweal’s, country’s ‘custom,’ commodity, conveniency? As for your ‘national church’ here mentioned, we shall take a just ‘measure’ of it when we come to your ninth question. And whereas you quote, in the margin, 1 Cor. xiv. 40, and xi. 34, on which you ground your ‘liberty’ to form your church-government, etc., suitably to each ‘particular civil government:’ alas, brother, these very Scriptures our Prelates abused to maintain their unlimited *liberty* of setting up their rites and ceremonies as suitable to the civil government! Which absurdity, I have fully repelled in my ‘Reply to Canterbury’s Relation.’ . . .^a We should have a mad world of it, if civil states, in several countries, should have liberty to frame church-government, etc., as should most suit with their particular conditions! . . . Thus came to be erected the hierarchical church-government in all pomp and points ‘suitable’ with the Roman monarchy: so dangerous is that ‘liberty’ which brings such bondage!

“Your second question is

‘Whether, if any kingdom or nation shall, by a national council, synod, and parliament, upon serious debate, elect such a public church-government—rites, discipline—as they conceive to be most consonant to God’s Word; to the laws [and] government under which they live, and [to the] manners of their people; and then settle them by a general law; all particular churches, members of that kingdom and nation, be not thereby actually obliged, in point of conscience and Christianity,^b readily to submit thereto, and noways to seek an exemption from it; under pain of being guilty of arrogancy, schism, contumacy, and liable to such penalties as are due to these offences?’

“I answer; that is, ‘Whether the kingdom and nation of England, etc.?’ The sum is, you would here make way for a political state-church-government, or a mixt church-government; partly according to ‘God’s Word,’ and partly ‘to the laws and government under which we live,’ and partly to the ‘manners of the people.’ *Humano capiti cervicem jungere equinam!* or, *Populo ut placerent, etc.!* Truly, brother, your very question is heretical; you must pardon the expression, which, otherwise, would not come home to the full truth. And your word ‘elect’ imports no less: . . . as men ‘conceive,’ is of the same signification with *αἵρεσις* . . . a taking up a heresy upon human *election*: . . . for you say not, such a ‘church-government’ as is most consonant to ‘God’s Word;’ but, such ‘as they conceive’ to be most consonant. So [that] you hang your ‘church-government’ upon men’s conceit or opinion of consonancy . . . and not upon a real and essential consonancy. Just like the Prelate of Canterbury who, in his ‘Relation,’ hangs the credit of the Scripture upon the author and ‘the opinion we have,’ saith he, ‘of his sufficiency;’ which I have noted in my Reply. But thus you open a wide sluice to let in an ocean of inundation of all sorts of religion into all parts of the world! . . . We need go no further, for the disfranchising of this your ‘liberty,’ . . . your own words are *ἀσίστατα*, they cannot cohere, in any true theological sense; for, first, we ought not to

^a 1640.

^b 1 Cor. xiv. 32, 33; Rom. xiii. 1, 2; 1 Pet. ii. 13—15; 1 Cor. x. 32, 33.

assume, or pretend a 'liberty' as left us of God, when we want our evidence, and are not able to produce our Magna Charta, the Scripture; and this, nor you, nor any man, can do. Again; nothing is more presumptuous than to attempt to mingle heaven and earth together; that is, to mingle Christ's kingdom with the kingdoms of the world, or to these, to frame and fashion that; which, what is it else but to set up a Babylonish church-government? Did the apostles thus? Did they frame Christ's kingdom and church-government to the laws and customs of the Roman empire? Or, did they vary their orders for church-government, etc., according to the 'different manners and customs' of those nations, countries, or provinces, where they planted their churches? Had they one order for the church of Corinth, and another for the churches of Galatia, and a third for the churches of Asia, and the rest? No! but, 'so ordain I in all churches,' saith the 'apostle';^a and 'concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye:'^b so also, for making of ministers and other church-officers!^c

"Again: your 'church-government' must be *conceived* to be 'consonant to God's Word;' yet with this restriction, or limitation, that it be also 'consonant' to the 'laws and government under which' we 'live.' You speak, indeed, like a pure lawyer and one that will stand for your profession, were this the way to uphold it: but cannot your law and our Gospel cotton [unite] together, unless the Gospel wear the law's livery, like to your Sergeant's gown, made up of two several colours? Or unless law and Gospel be woven together into a linsey-woolsey garment?... Certainly, a State stands strongest while most consonant to God's Word and to the 'church-government, etc.,' of Christ; and not when Christ's kingdom and government are made 'suitable' to the laws and customs of the State!... The kingly government of Christ; in his church, is not to be fashioned and moulded according to the laws and customs of temporal and civil States; but, contrarily, the laws of civil states are to be reduced to the rule of God's Word... If another Reformation shall be set up, wherein the people's 'manners' shall be no less looked upon than in the former,—as you here do more than seem to plead for,—I can conjecture, if not certainly divine, what a Reformation... your Church of England is like to have: for if you ask the Prelatical party, consisting of multitudes of their priests and of their ignorant and profane people, together with all the King's army, they will all, with one voice and vote, roar it out at the *Canon's* mouth, We will have the bishops' 'church-government and discipline' continued without alteration! If ye ask the ordinary Protestant professors at large, they cry, No, no; not that: but we will have such a church-government as, under which, we may enjoy no less liberty for our 'manners' than we had under the prelates!

"But you refer us to the 'serious debate' of a 'national council, synod, [and] parliament:' but yet give us leave to put a vast difference between all these and the Scripture, Christ's own voice!... If we can find out the mind of Christ by his immediate voice, we dare not suspend our belief and practice of it until we have it at the second-hand

^a 1 Cor. vii. 17.^b 1 Cor. xvi. 1.^c Acts i. 15, &c.; xiv. 23.

from men : . . commended unto us to be such as men 'conceive' to be . . 'consonant to God's Word.' Yet, forasmuch as we dare not 'pin our souls upon men's sleeves, as not knowing whither they might possibly carry them ;' ^a therefore we must examine all men's determinations in matters of religion by searching the Scriptures : . . for the Bereans are commended as the 'more noble' in that they examined, diligently and 'daily' even the apostle's doctrine by the Scriptures ; ^b and much more are we to 'try the spirits' ^c of men that are not apostles, and so not immediately inspired by the Holy Ghost with infallibility of truth, as never any general council, after the apostles, hath been : so as you know how miserably and shamefully general councils have erred . . And it cannot be unknown to you that even this Assembly of Divines are of different judgments about 'church-government, etc. ;' nor have they, perhaps, had so much time, since their being under the prelacy, as to be thoroughly informed of the way of churches commonly called 'Independent,' but that many of them may possibly gain much more knowledge of it by spending some more time and study in it.

"You seem to lead them such a way,—should they follow you,—as would necessarily bring them into an inevitable and inextricable error in case they should 'elect such a public church-government, rites, etc., as they *conceive* to be most consonant to God's Word, to the laws, government, under which we live, and manners of the people ;' for if they look upon the 'manners of the people ;' . . some men might 'conceive' that 'such' a church-government, etc., were 'most' suitable . . to such 'manners' as cannot easily be brought to 'enter in at the strait gate' and 'narrow way' that leads into Christ's kingdom. ^d And what 'church-government, etc.,' soever comes not full-home, in all things, to the 'Word of God,' is not that which is 'consonant' thereunto . . . Worthy of our observation is that of the Lord to the prophet Jeremy, xv. 19, 'If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth : let them return unto thee ; but return not thou unto them.' Whereupon, the most learned interpreter,—as the learned Beza constantly styles him,—Calvin, among other excellent observations on this place, thus concludeth, 'The sum is, that the Truth of God ought not to be bended according to man's will, or *conceit*, because God is not mutable ; so neither doth his Word admit of any change.' ^e Now, the form of church-government, etc., laid down in the New Testament, is a doctrine of Christ, and no more alterable according to the varieties of men's 'customs' and 'manners' in all nations and ages, than the Gospel itself is, which the apostle would not have to be altered into another Gospel : ^f though another Gospel cannot be ; as neither another kingdom of Christ, another church-government, another church-discipline, ought not to be, but that alone which we find in God's Word ; which must not be reduced or conformed,—as a nose of wax, to which the papists, as Hosius and Pighius do compare the Scripture,—to the fashions of worldly governments and popular manners, but these must

^a Camden's Remains.

^b Acts xvii. 11.

^c 1 John iv. 1.

^d Matt. vii. 13, 14.

^e Summa est, veritatem Dei non debere flecti ad hominem arbitrium, quia Deus non mutatur, ita nec verbum ejus ullam varietatem admittit.

^f Gal. i. 8, 9.

be conformed to the Scripture.^a Hence it may appear how rough your conclusion of this question is, if to such a general law as you propose, 'all particular churches, members of this kingdom and nation,' should not yield to be 'actually obliged in point of conscience and Christianity,' and 'readily to submit thereunto, and noways to seek an exemption from it; under pain of being guilty of arrogancy, schism, etc.' Good brother, be not so legal! What if that Resolution of an Assembly, and that general Law for the confirmation of it, be such as the 'conscience' of godly people cannot, without sin, submit thereunto? Must they either violate their consciences, or be undone by your unavoidable, intolerable, 'penalties,' as both to suffer in their good names for *arrogant, contumacious schismatics*, yea, and in their *consciences* too, under the *guilt* of these; and to be liable to I wot not what 'penalties' besides, and 'noways to seek an exemption?' Why, good brother, if we should go and live under the Turkish government, and could not in 'conscience' turn Turks in the religion there by law established, yet there is a *way* 'to seek an exemption' from it; namely, by becoming tributary to that State, as many Christians do! Good brother, let us not have any of Draco's laws executed upon innocents. And remember how, not long ago, the prelates served us; we could not have the benefit of law, of appeal, no 'exemption' from blood-letting, and ear-cropping, and pillorying, etc., and shall we now turn worse persecutors of the saints, than the prelates were? 'Non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco,' said that heathen princess.^b

"But in the margin you put some places of Scripture to prove this! . . . The first is, 'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets':^c and what of this? *ergo*, The spirit of all the prophets in England must be subject to the prophets in the Assembly! . . . The other places quoted by you are no less misapplied: will they prove, trow you, blind obedience! . . . Brother, make it clear unto us that an assembly of men, learned, pious,—what you will,—living in ages succeeding the apostles, have or ever had, infallibility of judgment so as to say, 'It pleased the Holy Ghost and us'^d to make these decrees: . . . for when you can resolve us of their conclusions no further than 'as they *conceive* to be consonant to the Word of God,' alas, Sir, you leave us in a wood, or maze; . . . for you know what variety of *conceits* many men have: quot capita, tot sententiæ, . . . In the conclave at Viterbium, after almost three years' agitation about the election of a new pope,—as many years as we have been about to set up a Reformation, and the foundation not yet laid,—each cardinal ambitiously aspiring to be the pope, one of them rose up and said 'Domine, etc., let us uncover the roof of this chamber, seeing the Holy Ghost cannot get in unto us through so many tiles.' . . .

"I come now to your third and fourth questions: but, lest my answers may prove too voluminous, and so fastidious, to every-day-news readers, I shall, in the rest contract myself. And this I must do by trussing up your questions within the lists of a syllogism, respectively; for, as I noted before, all your questions are rather conclusive than interrogatory, rather positive resolutions than unresolved questions. The sum, there-

^a Rom. xii. 2.^c 1 Cor. xiv. 32.^b "Dido;" Virg. *Æn.* I. 630.^d Acts xv. 28.

fore, of your third and fourth questions—for this dependeth on that—is reduced into this syllogism:—

That, which hath ‘sufficient,’ if not best warrant for it in the New Testament; the examples of the primitive church, etc., most prevents heresies, schisms, injustice; is to be received as a true and undoubted church-government, and to be preferred before that which hath no such express warrant in Scripture, no pattern for it, in the primitive, or best Reformed churches, etc.: But the Presbyterial form of church-government, if rightly ordered, hath ‘sufficient,’ if not best, warrant for it in the New Testament, etc.; the Independent, not so; Therefore, the former is to be preferred and received before the latter, without any long debate!

“Both your proposition [and assumption] are lame, and interfere one against the other: ‘sufficient, if not best warrant,’ will not prove so sufficient a warrant as if there be found a better; and so your argument [conclusion] by crossing . . . itself, falleth to [the] ground. Again; your ‘Presbyterial’ government hath neither ‘best’ nor any ‘sufficient warrant’ as we judge, ‘in the New Testament;’ no nor any ‘warrant’ at all in God’s Word: but the *true* form of church-government hath both ‘sufficient’ and, without comparison, ‘best, warrant’ in the Scripture; and . . . let me tell you, that that which you call ‘Independent’ is the only true, original, and primitive ‘presbyterial!’ Which presbytery, is proper and peculiar to every particular church of Christ: and is not a presbytery collective of many churches by way of jurisdiction, one or many over each, or of a ‘national church’ as you term it; for neither of these can you find either in the New Testament or in the Old. In the Old, we read of one church, to wit, that of the nation of the Jews, but that whole ‘church’^a was one entire congregation; they had one church-officer over all; it is called ‘the tabernacle of the congregation,’^b in the singular; and they all^c assembled three times in the year at Jerusalem, in the Temple, where they offered sacrifice, and not elsewhere: so as that church was a type of every particular church of Christ under the New Testament, as being both one entire church and absolute; subject to no other form of government but only that of the only lawgiver and mediator, Jesus Christ; and no pattern of any such ‘national church’ as you would have. Every particular church now, consisting of visible saints, is under Christ as the only head,^d king,^e governor,^f lawgiver,^g of it; and so is subject to no other jurisdiction than that of Christ, his Spirit, his Word. Were there no other particular church in the world than one, as that of Abraham’s family, should it not be a complete church until there were other churches on whose jurisdiction it should depend? Though, for ordinary families, they cannot have such a number as is requisite to make up a ministerial body, and so are bound to unite to others for this end. We hold communion and consociation of churches for counsel in doubts, and comfort in distress; but we deny any such combination of churches as whereby the true liberty of every particular church is taken away: and this communion of churches doth no less, if not more, ‘prevent’ heresies, schisms, injustice, than your ‘Presbyterial!’ Nor can you show reason to the contrary; and yet would you have our churches more perfect than those of the apostles’ own planting and gathering,^h as to be alto-

^a Acts vii. 38.^b Exod. xxix. 44.^c Deut. xvi. 16.^d Eph. i. 22.^e Psal. ii. 6.^f Matt. ii. 6.^g Jas. iv. 12.^h 1 Cor. xi. 19.

gether exempt from 'heresies, etc.' . . All those particular churches which the apostles planted, were all of absolute authority amongst themselves respectively, and equal one to the other: you cannot show us one rule or example to the contrary; that in Acts xv. is a transcendent, and stands alone, not to be paralleled; and therefore very impertinently objected by many, before you. . .

"For 'pattern' in the primitive churches after the apostles, we are not curious to seek it in the corrupt current of succeeding ages, when we find it in the pure fountain. [Still] it appears, say the Centurists, 'that the government of churches in the second hundredth year, was almost popular; every church had equal power of ordaining or casting out, if need were, those ministers they had ordained:'^a with other things, very material, in that whole Title.^b And for 'the best Reformed churches,' if in them we cannot find that 'pattern' so fully followed as the Scripture holds forth . . we crave leave, without prejudice, to take it, as we find it in the Word, without the least variation: and you may know [that] in the beginning of Protestant Reformation, they could [not] so clearly see in the dawning as we may now in the meridian, if we will but open our eyes. The Reformed churches have taken up, one or other of them, upon the matter, the main things we contend for. The Church of Holland receive none to the Table, nor to vote as a member, . . but such as first give satisfaction to the Eldership, and then to the Congregation; and, have a form of Covenant propounded by them.^c The French churches exercise excommuni-

^a Cent. I. Cap. vii., tit., De Consociatione Eccles.

^b As also, in tit., De Synodis Privatis.

^c "The predominant church in the Netherlands, prior to 1795, was that of the Reformed. By every departure from the formulary, as well as for the correction of those abuses to which the authority of the General Synod did not extend, the secular arm might be called in. The whole of this system fell to the ground in the last mentioned year; and the Established Church, then separated from the State, no longer enjoys any civil privileges. The present constitution of this country secures to all forms of worship, equal favour and protection." W. Steven, M.A., in his "Brief View of the Dutch Eccles. Establishment," appended to "The Hist. of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam, 1833." p. 383. Speaking of their modern practice, this writer tells us, "In Holland, clergymen are familiarly, but as a term of respect, called 'Dominies.' . . They generally read their discourses; and sometimes, though rarely, their prayers. . . Accompanied by an elder, they regularly make a professional visit to their members, from house to house, twice a year, immediately before the season of communion. They are also particularly careful whom they admit to the Lord's Table. Young people attend them for years together, for catechetical instruction. As auxiliaries, independent of the ministers, there are also subordinate licensed male and female teachers of religion, who keep private preparatory classes, and receive a small gratuity from their pupils. . . The sacrament of the Supper is administered once a quarter; . . and in the course of the week immediately preceding . . there is a preparation service, towards the conclusion of which, all the intending communicants stand up and answer in the affirmative, in presence of the congregation, a few questions put from the pulpit, comprehending a declaration, That they believe, with all their heart, the doctrine which they have confessed; that they resolve, through Divine grace, to adhere to that doctrine, and to lead a christian life; and that they will submit to the superintendence and the discipline of the church. . . Members of other Protestant congregations in the Netherlands are admissible to communion with the Reformed Church, provided that their moral character is unobjectionable." P. 392, 393.

cation in their particular congregations, though with liberty of appeal. . .

“Lastly : for ‘appeals’ in case of injustice, you know, brother, that if injustice be done in any civil matter, [and] redress may not be had by the mediation of the church whereof the parties are members, then the Law is open there [in that case] to appeal [to] for justice : and if it be about the church’s censure for some miscarriage of a member towards the church or any member thereof, [then] if the censure be unjust, the party grieved may desire to have his cause heard by some other churches who may, accordingly, deal with their sister church to require a brotherly account of the whole business : . . and, if it be in matter of opinion, here the appeal lies principally, and in the first place, to the Scripture as the supreme judge ; if the thing be obscure and too hard for that [any] church to resolve by the Scripture, then to call in the help of other churches for their best information. In sum ; there is no case can fall out, in any church, which hath not as many helps by a free communion of churches wherein every church’s peculiar liberties and privileges are preserved as they ought to be, as any [helps] you can name to be in your obligatory combination of churches whereby the liberty of each church is, by common consent, sold over to others, by which it [each church] ceaseth now to be a free church of Christ under his only jurisdiction. . . So as, hereby, great mischiefs may redound even to the purest church when once things come to be carried by the vote of a general or classical assembly of Divines swaying things besides the rule, and stretching them beyond their line ; and, therefore, famous was that saying of Nazianzen’s, ‘That he never saw any good to come of general councils :’^a because, commonly, camelionlike, they change their hue with the nearest object, complying with the condition of the present times and States : as, suppose, prelatical spirits should turn to be your Presbyterians ; or, as when,—in case the Lord Christ shall resume his kingdom over his churches in a civil state,—we should, perhaps, see some of your Presbyterians as fast to turn Independents, were the preferments suitable ! . . Brother, why should godly ministers, indeed, be yoked with such earth-worms and Mammonists^b as are in some parishes, and as some of your Presbyterian combination would necessitate us unto ? . .

“The fifth question is reduced thus :

That, whose grounds and reasons tend, inevitably, to endanger, overthrow, and embroil, ecclesiastical or civil forms of government, ought not to be suffered : But such is the Independent church-government ; it tends, inevitably, etc. : Therefore it ought not to be suffered.

“I deny the assumption. The grounds and reasons of true church-government do not, in their own nature, tend to the endangering, etc.^c . . If they produce any such effect, it is only accidental ; and the main cause is in such ecclesiastical or civil bodies, when they show some antipathy, in their constitution, to Christ’s kingdom. . .

^a Ad. Procop. Ep. 42.

^b “He is one very meanly gifted, now-a-days, that will be wooed and won to take a Benefice under a hundred, or six-score, pounds.” P. 21.

^c Confess. of Augsburg, art. vii., in Harm. Confess. sect. 11.

“The sixth question : the sum whereof is,

That which, from the beginning of the preaching of the Gospel downwards till this present age, had no being in the world, can, doubtless, be no church-government of Christ's or his apostles': But such—you say—is the government of Independent churches : Therefore, not Christ's or the apostles' church-government.

“I deny your assumption : and, for further answer thereto, I refer you to my answer to your third and fourth questions. . . You can never prove your classical or synodical jurisdiction of either a provincial church, as you call it, or a general council over every particular church, to have the least footing or being at all in the Scriptures. In the ecclesiastical histories for the first two hundred years we find, as was noted above, sufficient ground for it [communion with sister churches], but none for the combined, coercive Presbytery ; let that be shown. Afterwards, indeed, as times grew worse, you find your ‘patriarchal, metropolitanical, prelatical, national, provincial, church-governments ; general and provincial councils, subordination and subjection of the lesser churches to the greater :’ . . . And if ‘the mystery of iniquity’ began to ‘work’^a even in the apostles’ own times ; which was the very hierarchy itself in the affectation of primacy, as we see practised by Diotrephes, who is noted to be *ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων*, a lover of primacy, or pre-eminence, and that above the apostle John himself, with other like *suitable* practices !^b . . . But suppose there were no examples to be found of it [absolute and free churches] in church-story, . . . nevertheless you know, brother, when a man's evidences of lands are lost, there be public records, as the rolls of Chancery, where they may be found again ; and if there they be found, will you not allow them, because the man cannot otherwise show them ? Now we have the Sacred Scriptures, where our evidences are safely recorded : suffice it then, that there we show them ! The contrary opinion doth manifestly establish traditions unwritten, as the papists do. And to give the reader some intimation, how the churches of Christ came . . . in short time after the apostles, to lose their liberties, I note that passage in Ambrose [bishop of Milan] who lived within the fourth century : upon 1 Tim. v. 17, ‘The Jews’ synagogue, and afterwards the Christian church, had Elders, without whose counsel nothing was done in the church : which, by what neglect it grew out of use, I know not, unless it were, perhaps, the sloth or rather pride of the Teachers ; whilst, alone, they would seem to be somebody.’ . . .^c This is the greater rarity and antiquity ; and much to be wondered at, how it escaped the ‘Expurgatory Index’ by those that were the first fathers of ‘the mystery of iniquity,’ that they did not quite expunge this record also, that not a pin of the old pattern should remain. Now, that the church there . . . was a particular congregation answerable to the synagogue . . . cannot be denied : whereby all may clearly see in how short a time the government of churches instituted by Christ and his apostles came to be changed, from being free churches to become servile, and subject to the usurpation of the greater ; the prelates and their

^a 2 Thess. ii. 7.

^b 3 John 9, 10.

^c “Synagoga, et postea Ecclesia Seniores habuit, quorum sine consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia. Quod qua negligentia obsoleverit nescio, nisi Doctorum desidia, aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri.” Comment. in cap. v. Epist. i. ad. Tim.

clergy now making up the church: . . . Christ's kingdom, now being turned into an oligarchy, or oligarchical tyranny. . .

“The seventh question is thus reduced;

Those churches which do not conform their government to some one or other public form of civil government, dividing themselves into many parochial churches, dioceses, provinces; but do gather churches not out of infidels, but of men already converted to and settled in the Christian faith, and do admit them into the church by way of covenant; no one example, or direct Scripture, reason, or authority, can be produced to satisfy conscience of their lawfulness: But such are the Independent churches; they do not conform as aforesaid: Therefore, conscience cannot be satisfied of their lawfulness.

“The argument, or question, contains many branches, scarcely reducible to one head; but I have bundled them into one cord as well as I could. And, for answer, this question is coincident with all that went before, and so is already, in that respect, answered. Your parrallel, betwixt the civil association and ecclesiastic, is not grounded on the Scripture! . . . The churches planted by the apostles, were called and gathered out of the wide world where the Word of God came and took place [effect]. . . But you object the gathering of churches ‘not of infidels but of men already converted to and settled in the christian faith; of which form of congregating churches,’ you say you could never discern example, or any direct Scripture, ‘to satisfy conscience.’ We would gladly say ‘amen’ to that assertion that the whole nation is Christian, established in the faith; but if [the whole nation be] not, you dispute *ex falso supposito*. May it please you then, brother, to take notice of the ‘example’ both of John Baptist^a—and of Christ himself,^b and of the apostles,^c who all of them did call and gather Christian churches out of the Jews’ church! Which might suffice ‘to satisfy’ any man’s ‘conscience’ in this point. . . But there is yet one thing more for which, you say you can ‘see no ground:’ and that is a ‘particular church covenant.’ Why should the lawfulness of this be doubted, whether explicit or implicit? . . . Who are fit to receive the seals of the covenant, but such as profess to be in covenant? And, surely, if any shall refuse to make this profession, of their being in covenant, as being ashamed thereof, with what ‘conscience’ can the church admit them into fellowship? . . . But it will be said, We have covenanted already in the national covenant. This is against things, upon supposition that we were convinced of the evil of them; but not about our own persons, as inquiring whether we indeed are willing to give up ourselves to the Lord Jesus. This [national covenant] was put in [force] by such outward authority that many, for fear, took it; which a church-covenant, under the Gospel, where the people are to be such as come willingly, will not bear. . .

“The eighth question, though somewhat involved, and perplexed with many branches, yet the scope being to prove a national church, and so ‘a common Presbyterian, classical, government, to which, particular congregations [and] persons ought to be subordinate;’ and thereby ‘an apparent subversion of the novel Independent invention;’ these are your words. The whole I reduce into form thus:

Where there be infallible proofs of National-churches, there, of necessity, must be a common Presbyterian, classical, government, to which, particular congregations

^a Matt. iii. 5, 7.

^b John iv. 1.

^c Acts ii. 40.

[and] persons ought to be subordinate, to the apparent subversion of the novel Independent invention ; But there be infallible proofs of National-churches ; as the catholic church, the national church of the Jews, the synodal assembly of the apostles,^a who made and sent binding degrees to the churches ; seconded with all œcumenical, national, provincial councils, synods ; and the church-government exercised throughout the world in all Christian realms or states, from their first reception of the Gospel till this present : compared with Acts vii. 38 ; ii. 47 ; v. 11 ; viii. 1, 3 ; xii. 5 ; xv. 22 ; xx. 28 ; Matt. xvi. 18 ; Eph. iii. 10, 21 ; v. 25, 27, 29, 32 ; Col. i. 18, 24 ; 1 Tim. iii. 5, 15 : Therefore, there must be, of necessity, a common Presbyterian, classical, government, to which, particular congregations [and] persons ought to be subordinate, to the apparent subversion of the novel Independent invention.

“ Now, for answer to this large argument, briefly ; and first, to the Proposition . . . Brother, you must give us leave to stand upon this as for our lives, That we dare not admit of any churches as the true and genuine churches of Christ which, also, are not of his own institution ; that is, such as are not called and gathered by the voice of Christ, in his Word ; and by that sceptre of his, swayed ; and by that alone law of his, governed . . . You must first be able to found your national church in the Scripture ; or assure yourself, if a man will build upon it ‘ a common Presbyterian, classical, government,’ and dwell there, he will bring an old house upon his head ! But to come to your particular instances in the Assumption : . . . the first is, the ‘ catholic church throughout the world.’ What is this, to a national church ? . . . The second instance is, the national church of the Jews . . . Bring us any one national, that is, one entire church, or congregation, as that of the Jews was ; or that is of one family, as that was ; or that is a type of Christ’s spiritual kingdom, as that was ; or that is the universal church of God visible on earth, as that was ; or that is governed by the like laws that that was ;—when yourself do confess that the government of your national churches is to be regulated by human laws, customs, manners ; and not by God’s Word alone : whereas that of the Jews was wholly governed by God’s own law, and not at all by the laws of men, until it came to be corrupted . . . And you confess also, that the government of your national churches is alterable : . . . whereas . . . the Jews’ was unalterable, till Christ himself did put a period to that economy. In a word, your national churches are a mixed multitude, consisting, for the greatest part, of profane persons ; being as a confused lump whereof there are nine parts of leaven to one of pure flour, so as the whole is miserably soured : . . . but that of the Jews, in its natural and external constitution, was all holy, ‘ a holy nation, a royal priesthood ;’^b ‘ all the congregation holy, every one of them.’^c Your third instance is the synodal assembly, Acts xv. . . And what of this ? Therefore national churches, or general councils, or provincial, have the like power ! . . . Why, first of all, that assembly was not a national church representative : secondly, neither was it a general or provincial council : thirdly, . . . it could not err, for the apostles had infallibility of judgment, being guided by the Holy Ghost . . . and the elders and brethren did assent to their determinations ! . . . But you add, all this is ‘ seconded with all œcumenical, national, provincial councils, etc.,

^a Acts xv.^b Exod. xiv. 5, 6.^c Num. xvi. 3.

throughout the world, in all 'Christian realms, etc.' Alas, brother, all these put together are in no sort *suitable* to make a second to that apostolical assembly! . . . And, whereas you make the upshot of this your question to the 'apparent subversion of the novel Independent invention;' we have proved it to be neither man's 'invention' . . . nor 'novel;' . . . nor yet 'Independent,' otherwise than that it depends not upon any human authority or jurisdiction out of itself. . . . The dependency of the English church is known.

"The ninth question is thus reduced, in sum :

That 'liberty' which the apostles had and used in ordaining, supplying, instituting new rites, orders, canons, etc., for the churches' peace and welfare, they transmitted to posterity: But the apostles had and used such 'liberty,' etc.: Therefore, the same 'liberty' have all churches in the world, in all ages succeeding the apostles', in ordaining, supplying, etc.

"I answer to the Proposition, first, That the 'apostles' themselves had no other 'liberty' to do anything about the calling, planting, ordering, and regulating of churches, but what they had immediately given them by Christ and his Spirit: secondly, This 'liberty' so given them, reached no further than to those things only which were given them in charge, and which they accordingly, as faithful stewards, did practise concerning the churches: even as Christ himself, being the Son of God, and set 'over his house,' was 'faithful' in all things;^a doing nothing but what he had by special commission and command from the Father. . . . If, therefore, they who profess to succeed the apostles . . . will challenge the same 'liberty' which the apostles had, . . . they must, first of all, show us their immediate commission from Christ: . . . secondly, they must all show us that what they do, in church matters, under colour and pretence of apostolical 'liberty,' is none other but what they have by express command from Christ, by his Spirit: and, thirdly; because they are not able to show this, they must use their 'liberty' no further than the lists and limits of Scripture permit, which holds forth an exact and perfect rule for all precisely to observe. . . . What reason can any reasonable man give, why Christ . . . should be less careful over his church, in the New Testament, [than about the Tabernacle, a type of Christ's church under the Gospel;] so as to leave it, at sixes and sevens, to the 'liberty' of all kingdoms and nations of the world to set up . . . what government, discipline, rites, ceremonies, canons, they pleased, upon what pretence soever, as 'for the churches' peace and welfare?' Hath not the opening of this one sluice let in such an inundation of all manner of human inventions, in this kind, as hath wellnigh drowned the whole world in all manner of superstition and error? . . . If one church, for the smallness of it, have fewer officers, and another church, for the largeness of it, more in number,—as the church in Jerusalem had need of seven deacons, both for the magnitude of the congregation and the multitude of the poor therein, Acts vi.—yet this makes no variation in the form of church government, as differing one from another, either for substance or circumstance, saving only 'secundum magis et minus,' as a little man is a man as well as the tallest man. . . . We dare go no

^a Heb. iii. 5, 6.

further than the Scripture leads us; therefore, [you argue], we are a company of infants! Good brother, call in these extravagants...

“The tenth question is reduced thus:

Such as cannot produce any one ‘solid reason’ why they ought not, in point of conscience, willingly to submit to a Presbyterial government—in case it shall be established among us by the general consent of the Synod and Parliament,—as most consonant to God’s Word and the laws and government of our realm, ought to be reputed to be in a high degree of obstinacy, singularity, arrogancy, self-ends, and peremptory schism: But Independents cannot produce any one solid reason why they ought not so to do: Therefore, Independents ought to be reputed to be in a high degree of obstinacy, singularity, etc.

Now, truly, brother, a heavy charge you lay upon those poor creatures you do so becall ‘Independents;’ as first, of ‘obstinacy:’ if that be ‘obstinacy’ against men’s consciences, not to yield blind obedience to men’s commands in point of religion! Secondly, of ‘singularity:’ if that be ‘singularity,’ for a few to enter in at the strait gate, and to walk in the narrow way: if that be ‘singularity,’ to do that which the multitude will not do; to come under the government of Christ’s kingdom in the government of our consciences, and of his churches; which is a principle you yourself, in terms, cannot, dare not, deny! Thirdly, of ‘arrogancy:’ if that be ‘arrogancy,’ for one church not to exalt itself over another, or for pastors not to lord it over their flocks! Fourthly, of ‘self-ends:’ if that be self-seeking, which—if any other—is a self-denying, and a taking up of our cross daily, as malefactors ready to be crucified; as without which resolution we cannot follow Christ: if that be self-seeking, to strip ourselves of the preferments and favours of the world; to be exposed naked to the reproach of all; to be accounted the outcasts of the world, and the offscouring of all things, as at this day! And, lastly, of ‘peremptory schism:’ if that be ‘schism,’ whereby we ought to separate ourselves from all doctrines ‘contrary’ to what is delivered, Rom. xvi. 17; and, so far as is possible, from all ‘the rudiments of the world;’ from the ordinances of men, which are ‘not after Christ,’^a that so we might adhere to him, and ‘walk in him;’^b being ‘taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus!’^c But now, that these ‘Independents’ should undergo all these *τὰ σκληρὰ*, ‘hard speeches,’^d and yet not be able to show one ‘solid reason’ for it, surely then a fool’s cap and a bell were fittest for them!... Now to your argument: first of all, I might deny the necessity of the consequence of your Proposition; for it is not necessary that every truth should cease to be truth, because every one cannot show a ‘solid reason’ for it... The martyrs, some of them, professed [that] they could not dispute for that Truth they held; but, say they, ‘we can die for it!’... The apostle saith, ‘What, if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?’^e But I flatly deny your Assumption, and affirm that your ‘Independents’ have, and do, and can, produce many ‘solid’ reasons why they may not, ought not, ‘in point of conscience, willingly to submit to such a Presbyterial government’ as you prescribe... One ‘reason’ is, ‘consonant to God’s Word’ and ‘conform to the laws of this or any other realm,’ cannot stand together;... because Christ’s

^a Col. ii. 8.

^b Ver. 6.

^c Eph. iv. 21.

^d Jude, 15.

^e Rom. iii. 3.

kingdom is so transcendent, so absolute, distinct, 'Independent,'—if you will,—as it is not obliged to conform and stoop to 'human laws,' and 'people's manners,' as you put a necessity upon it: a second 'reason;' because you require obedience to that which men shall 'conceive' consonant to God's Word, etc.; touched before, and now again to put you in mind: . . . a third 'reason' . . . is, because you require absolute obedience to the general consent of Assembly and Parliament. Now, we dare not pin our faith upon generality of men's opinions; the generality of the votes of the Jews' State carried it away, to crucify their King. If the whole world might vote this day, the generality would be against Christ, as he is indeed the only anointed King, Priest, and Prophet. What! if the generality vote amiss, while yet they may 'conceive' all to be right, because 'consonant' to what they most affect? No; though orthodox and godly, as was showed in the instance of Paphnutius, in the council of Nice. A fourth 'reason;' because we acknowledge Christ alone to be Lord of our conscience: . . . 'The magistrate rules the body, not the mind:'.^a A fifth 'reason;' because the Holy Ghost, by the apostle, expressly condemns all human ordinances in matters of faith and religion; . . . as Col. ii. 8—23. A sixth 'reason;' because it is antichristian to deny Jesus to be the Christ; that is, the only King, Priest, and Prophet of his church. He is 'antichrist,'^b that 'denieth' any of these three offices; but to deny Christ to be the only King of his church, is to deny him in one of his incommunicable offices; and they thus deny Jesus to be the Christ, that place man with Christ in his throne; that set 'human laws and customs of all nations' cheek-by-jole with the word of God! . . . These may suffice, that you may see there be some 'reasons' which your 'Independents' can produce; and those so 'solid' as [that] the gates of hell shall not prevail against. But, say you, if we thus claim 'exemption' from such binding decrees of men in the matters of Christ, and that 'in point of conscience,' then may also 'papists, anabaptists, and all other sects, claim the like exemption, upon the like grounds.' Brother, for that, I hope you will put a difference between orthodox churches and heterodox. But I say again, for any man's 'conscience,' be it never so erroneous, as that of papists, yet certainly the 'conscience' of such, simply considered in itself, nor you nor any man in the world hath anything to do further than to instruct and admonish, and labour to inform and rectify: enforce it you may not. . . . Magistrates may not tolerate open popery and idolatry to be set up in the land; but the 'conscience' of a papist they are no masters or judges of. If the civil magistrate see any of God's commandments actually violated, 'he beareth not the sword for nought;'^c evil actions he must punish: but he hath no power over the 'conscience' of any . . . so long as he makes no open breach of God's commandments, or the just laws of the land. . . . In your twelfth question you confess so much; reproving,—but how justly?—your 'Independents' for censuring the very 'hearts and spiritual estates' of others; and alleging that Scripture, Matt. vii. 1. . . Brother, let me put it to your 'conscience:' Do you think it equal, that

^a Harm. Confess. sect. 11.

^b 1 John ii. 22.

^c Rom. iii. 4.

either your conscience should be a rule of mine, or mine of yours? And if no one man's conscience may be the rule of another's, certainly neither may all the men's consciences in the world be the judge of any one man's...

“Concerning the eleventh question;

It containeth nothing but grievous invectives against the way you call ‘Independent.’ You call it ‘a seminary of schisms, and dangerous divisions in church [and] state:’

“So did Tertullus, the Jews’ advocate against Paul, charge him, Acts xxiv. 5. You pretend to ponder it ‘in the balance of Scripture, or right reason; but you neither show us Scripture nor right reason, to balance it in. You call it ‘a floodgate to let in an inundation of heresies, errors, sects, libertinism, and lawlessness; without means of suppressing them, when introduced.’ For this, you bring Mr. Williams’s ‘Bloody Tenet.’ Now, suppose him, or his book, ‘heretical;’ will you make the way of Christ so too? There was one Judas, a traitor; shall, therefore, all the rest of the apostles, or [of] apostolical calling, be so too? You allege, also, ‘anabaptistical, antinomian, heretical, atheistical opinions,’ as of ‘the soul’s mortality,’ ‘divorce at pleasure;’ will you therefore, father all these upon Christ’s kingly government? In Luther’s time, sundry ‘heresies’ sprung up; was Luther, therefore, either the cause or occasion of them?.. Never greater errors have been than since the Gospel hath clearly shined forth. True it is, indeed, that these divisions, and diversities of opinions, are, with bleeding hearts, to be bewailed; but shall ‘the Gospel of the Kingdom’ bear the burden of all? This were as with the Christians in Rome, in Nero’s time; when any judgment of God fell upon the city, he would still impute it to the Christians, and punish them for it: but we are taught better... Let not that Imperial edict be revived, ‘That if any confessed themselves to be Christians, they should be put to death:’ so such as you call ‘Independents’ should for this very name suffer... Human power is as well a ‘means’ to maintain ‘heresies,’ as to ‘suppress’ them... Orthodox Independent churches are as good ‘means’ as any other; together with the care and countenance of the magistrate, if it may be had, to defend them, and enable them to send forth labourers; without which, the Presbytery will be as barren—breast and womb—as any other.

“The twelfth question:

The sundry passages of this question, as I find them scattered along, I shall glean them, and so bundle them up for a Conclusion, at this time: for this question seems to be a ‘Lerna’^a of queries!

“And first; You quarrel with the title of ‘Independents.’ Truly, brother, none of all those whom you thus intitle, do at all glory in this name, so as to give you thanks for your so often styling them thus, in one poor sheet of paper; seeing they cannot imagine you do it ‘honoris gratia,’ while everywhere you set it as a brand. Notwithstanding, we are not so ashamed of it as utterly to disclaim it; and that for two reasons: first, for distinction’ sake between us and that which you call your ‘Presbyterial government:’ the second is, because this word, ‘Independent,’ is to signify that we hold all Particular Churches of Christ

^a Lerna malorum.

to be of equal authority, and none to have, or exercise, jurisdiction over another; but that each Church is under Christ's government as the sole Head, King, Lord, Lawgiver, thereof. But we would not, that you should give us this as a nick-name, or a name of reproach, or a badge of scorn; nor that you should call us so, as if we denied subjection to civil authority in matters of civil government; nor yet, that you should mean such an 'Independency,' as if we held not good correspondence with all sister churches, by way of consociation, consultation, communion, communication; mutual consolation, supportation; and, in a word, in all things, duties, offices, as wherein Christ's kingdom is held up, the graces of the churches exercised, and the liberties of each church preserved entire; which is the glory of Christ: and, therefore, you mightily mistake the matter, when you interpret 'Independency' as not 'needing both the communion and assistance of other persons, nations, churches!' Then, secondly, you question, 'Whether the National Covenant, doth not, in sundry respects, strongly engage the nation against Independency?' Truly, brother, not at all; so long as all our Reformation is to be reduced to and regulated by the Word of God: and that is a sure foundation whereon our 'Independency' dependeth. In which respect, the nation is, by the Covenant, engaged *for* 'Independency.' Thirdly; you query, 'Whether, if Independency,—rightly taken still, as before,—'stript of all disguising pretences, be not Pharisaical, vain-glorious, self-conceitedness.' Here, brother, you lash us with a whip of many cords, but that our armour is proof. . . And that all this should come from a friend, a brother, a sufferer; from a companion and counsellor; how hard is it to be borne! And, you tell us of 'disguising [disguised] pretences,' 'if stript;' and for this, you have provided an unmasking for us. O brother, we have no such 'disguisings' as to fear your unmaskings! We may, in this, boldly answer with the apostle; 1 Thess. ii. 3—5. . . Si sat est accusasse, quis innocens erit? If a bare and malicious accusation be enough to fasten a crime, who shall be innocent? . . . You charge us with 'passing uncharitable censures upon men's hearts and spiritual estates; of which,' say you, 'God never made them judges, and forbids' us 'to judge, because He only knows men's hearts.' . . . What do you see in the Independency, that you should thus judge them? . . . Are they ambitious of preferments, of glory of the world, of favour of great ones, of praise of men, that do voluntarily forsake all and 'strip' themselves of all to follow naked Christ? . . .^a We do, say you, 'deem' ourselves too 'transcendently holy, sanctified and religious above others,' that we 'esteem them altogether unworthy of, yea, wholly exclude them' from our 'communion and church-society, as Publicans, heathen, or profane persons,—though, perhaps, as good or better Christians, than' ourselves,—'unless they will submit to their church-covenants and government, refusing all true brotherly familiarity, society, with them.' So you. Now, brother Prynne, I confess I am one of those whom you call 'Independents;' and did you ever observe any such supercilious strangeness of carriage in me towards you and other of your and my friends, no less zealous against Independents than yourself, as you charge

^a "Nudum Christum, nudus sequere."—Hieron.

us withal? Have there not been many interchangeable invitations between you and me, with loving acceptations, whereby we have enjoyed mutual society in all friendly and brotherly entertainment, saving still some quarrels about this way, but ever parting friends? . . . And neither at this day, since these your *invectives* came forth,—though they were no small grief to me, and that even for your sake,—am I become a greater stranger to you either in face or affection, than I was before. . . . But, however, brother, either be more moderate in censuring, or else censure not at all without just cause! But we ‘exclude,’ say you, ‘[perchance] as good, or better,’ than ourselves, from ‘communion and church-society’ with us. Surely it may be so; but, brother, *we* ‘exclude’ them not; they exclude themselves: and you give the reason, Because they will not ‘submit! to the church’s government.’ It doth not hence follow, that we therefore ‘deem’ either ourselves ‘so transcendently holy,’ as you say, or others ‘altogether unworthy.’ . . . The truth is,—for we love no disguising, as to need any unmasking,—we love not, in a time of Reformation after a general tincture of superstition and will-worship, blindly to go to work to admit of all comers, and to cast Christ’s ‘pearls’ and ‘holy things’ to such as we know not: or, if we be persuaded they be truly godly, and yet are not persuaded of the warrantableness of this way, how can they, with a good conscience, *desire* communion with us; and if not, how can the church *receive* them? . . . Christ commends ‘the angel of the church of Ephesus,’ for not bearing with those that are wicked, and for trying those that said they were ‘apostles,’ and were not, but were found ‘liars:’^a so, some may come that profess themselves to be Christians, that is, to be godly, to be believers; but we dare not receive them without trial: if they refuse to be tried, we may the more suspect them. . . . Others may take a broader way, if they please; we dare not. . . . How strict the Jews were, Ainsworth, in Gen. xii. 17, relates, out of the Rabbins. And even Bellarmine himself, had such a clear apprehension of the general nature of Christ’s church, . . . that he useth these words, ‘The Church, especially and intentionally, gathereth only believers; such as have true faith in their heart. And when any hypocrites are mingled among such, as truly believe not, it falleth out besides the intention of the Church: for if it could know them, it would never admit them; or being casually admitted, it would forthwith exclude them.’^b And truly, brother, we desire to do this, that, if it be possible, no misbeliever, no profane liver, no hypocrite, be admitted a member of Christ’s body; though a hypocrite, having his vizard on, may sometimes creep in unawares.^c . . . We suspect the gold that will not abide the touch. A Christian name, may silver over the copper, such as the Scripture calls ‘reprobate silver:’^d though we know each current coin hath its allowance of alloy; and each believing saint, so many grains’ allowance, but

^a Rev. ii. 2.

^b “Ecclesia præcipuè et ex intentionè, fideles tantum colligit, qui veram fidem in corde habent. Cum autem admiscuntur aliqui ficti, qui verè non credunt, id accidit præter intentionem Ecclesiæ. Si enim eos nosce posset, nunquam admitteret, aut casu admissos, continuè excluderet.—De Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 10. See also, Dr. Field, Of the Church; bk. i. chap. 7.”

^c “Such were called, of old, Παρείσακτοι.—Euseb.”

^d Jere. vi. 30.

all sincere, nothing counterfeit. As for church-covenants, we have sufficiently spoken before. The last charge you lay upon Independency is 'uncharitableness; carelessness and neglect of one another's welfare;' and the like.

"Brother, for 'uncharitableness,' let our practices, the best proofs of true charity, plead for us. We have manifested our love and loyalty to the State whereof we are natural and political members; for the safety thereof, we have poured out our estates to the very bottom: we dare herein, compare with all others of our rank and means. Myself, a poor man, am out for the State, between four and five hundred pounds; and I bless God I have done it with a cheerful heart... And, besides their means, none have more prodigally adventured and spent their lives, for the State, than your Independents have; and for none hath the God of battles^a appeared more! And but for the stirring up envy,—which needs not,—I should put you in mind of Marston-moor.^b In a word, brother, we dare challenge all the world in point of fidelity to the State, and our native country. Where be they that more love, honour, our Senate, Synod, Synedrion? Who pray more frequently, more fervently for them?... And for true charitableness, where is it to be found if not in those churches you call 'Independent?' But, you will say, this love is among ourselves: and God grant it may ever be so; yet it ends not here; but extends to all.^c And, brother, for a close, I challenge you to show me any parochial-congregation in England wherein there is, or can be, the like love one to another; the like care one for another; the like spiritual watchfulness one over another; the like union and communion of members in one mystical body, in a sympathy of affections in such a fraternity as is described, Psalm cxxxiii., a lively type of a true Church of Christ. Till you show us the like in any of your parochial-assemblies, consisting of your mixed multitude, good brother, restrain your spirit, so mightily embittered against us, lest in charging us with 'uncharitableness,' yourself alone be found to be uncharitable! And so I have done with your first Twelve Questions."

In entering upon his Answer to Prynne's "Independency Examined, Unmasked, Refuted, by Twelve New particular Interrogatories: Detecting both the manifold Absurdities, Inconveniencies, that must necessarily attend it, to the great disturbance of the Church, [and] State; the diminution, subversion, of the lawful undoubted Power of the Christian Magistrates, Parliaments, Synods; and shaking the chief Pillars, wherewith its Patrons would support it. 1644." 4to. pp. 12:^d Burton proceeds, with the same reluctance, to treat his fellow-sufferer as an enemy.

"My dear Brother; to your twelve 'New Interrogatories,' I present you with a *new* Answer: I call it *new*, because I shall cull such pas-

^a 2 Chron. xxxii. 8.

^b July 2nd, 1644.

^c On this point, what says Richard Baxter? "I saw a commendable care of serious holiness and discipline in most of the Independent churches." *Life and Times*, 1696, *fo. lib. i. pt. ii. p. 140.* Also, what says Philip Henry? "In two things the Independents are to be commended; they keep up discipline among them; they love, and correspond one with another." *Life*, Edit. 1825, 8vo. chap. vi. p. 128.

^d Re-printed, 1651. 4to.

sages^a as I find *new*, or not so much insisted on in your former twelve... But, brother, I find not that in your book, which you pretend in your title; to wit, the *unmasking* of Independency. Nor can we expect it of you; for, in your Proem, you say that 'the Independents have not, dogmatically and in direct terms, discovered the full truth of what they assert.' If not, what kind of visage will you discover when you have taken off the mask? Surely, by *your* handling... you mean to unmask some hag's face!...

"In your Preface... you say, we 'politically conceal the principal grounds and more deformed parts of our church-platform, for fear of miscarrying.'... Who told you so?... And what do you else but refute upon bare conjectures, and abatarum more pugnando, as those at blind-man's buff?...

"For your first question, 'Whether the Independent form of church-government be anywhere to be found in the Old or New Testament?'... This is no new interrogatory, unless you put the greater difference between 'questions' and 'interrogatories.'... Why, brother, this House of God, wherein Christ rules as King, stands upon so many principles as so many main pillars, not to be shaken: as, 1. It is a spiritual house, whose only builder and governor is Christ, and not man. 2. It is a spiritual kingdom, whose only king is Christ, and not man. 3. It is a spiritual republic, whose only lawgiver is Christ, etc. 4. It is a spiritual corporation or body, whose only head is Christ, etc. 5. It is a communion of saints, governed by Christ's Spirit, not man's. 6. Christ's church is a congregation called and gathered out of the world by Christ's Spirit and Word, and not by man!... And out of these principles do issue these conclusions: 1. That no man is the builder of this spiritual house. 2. That no man nor power, on earth, hath a kingly power over this Kingdom. 3. That no earthly law-givers may give laws for the government of this republic. 4. That no man may claim or exercise a headship over this body. 5. That no man can or ought to undertake the government of this communion of saints. *Item*, That none are of this communion, but visible saints: *ergo*, A true visible church of Christ cannot be defined, or confined, to a parochial multitude. *Item*, That the government of this communion is not extrinsical, but intrinsic, by the Spirit of the Word, and by the Word of the Spirit. 6. That men may not appoint, limit, constitute, what congregations of all sorts they please, to be churches of Christ; as nations, and parishes...

"In your answer to your Antiquerist,^a p. 6, you do, in part, grant Christ to be King internally, in the soul; which you say 'may pass for tolerable.' O brother, no more, but 'may pass for tolerable!' You, that are so large-hearted to your friends, are you so strait-laced to Christ?... If man should set up a form of government, over the church of Christ, to which all must conform; then, of necessity, should man be lord over the conscience:... and then, what mischiefs would follow!... Then, must your words come to pass, 'If a moderated or regulated Episcopacy, the same with Presbytery, should, by the Synod's advice, be unanimously established in Parliament, as most conso-

^a See on, p. 415, note e.

nant to the Scriptures, and most agreeable to the civil government, I shall readily submit unto it without opposition; and why not you, and all others?' So you, p. 6. O, brother, I stand amazed!...

"Your second interrogatory is about the lawful power of civil magistrates, in all matters of church-government; wherein you tax 'some Independents' for extraordinarily eclipsing the same... You allege for this, a passage in the Answer of 'Two of the Brethren to A. S.,'^a for which one of them is lately questioned; but I hope he will clear himself... Those patriarchs and princes of Israel, before the Law, and under the Law; from Adam to Christ; never had this power, or prerogative, to make ecclesiastical laws or binding canons; no, nor yet Moses, nor 'kings of Judah, Israel,' and 'General assemblies, princes, nobles, chief captains, and elders of the people,' as you muster them up together in your marginal note:^b a seeming goodly army, indeed; but so many shadows of men, for any such power they had, as you, with your penful of ink, paint out unto us!... And, therefore, your inference upon such empty premises, That, 'therefore, under the Gospel, by like reason and equity,' it 'must needs belong to Christian princes, magistrates, parliaments, to whom Christ hath delegated his kingly office, etc.' is of no consequence...

"To the third interrogatory: touching this, 1. We assume not the power to gather churches, but being sent, or called, to preach 'the Word of the kingdom,'^c thereby people, thus called of God, come to be gathered into church-fellowship; and so, by consent do choose their own officers—2. Such as are thus called to acknowledge Christ their only King, were not begotten to this 'acknowledgment' by such ministers as you speak of, who deny, disclaim, and preach against Christ's kingly government over men's consciences and churches...—3. Such ministers, when they set up Christ's government, may—being agreed upon by all sides—have those parishioners again that, for want of it, at the first went from them.—4. Our solemn vow and covenant obligeth us not to anything that is prejudicial to the authority of God's Word, and the liberty of a good conscience; considering how churches are gathered out of all the world, not this place nor that, not this house nor that, but out of 'every nation'^d such as fear God; and out of every 'house' the sons of 'peace,' and out of every 'city' or town, all that 'receive' the Gospel, are called and gathered to Christ!^e—5. Concerning christian liberty in joining to several churches as, in the same house, some to affect one, some another; you know what Christ saith, Luke xii. 51—53: and it is God that persuadeth Japheth to 'dwell in the tents of Shem.'^f And, brother, all that noise you make all along, with extreme aggravations, as 'confusion, distraction, implacable contestations, schisms, tumults, etc. ;'^g what are they but the very out-

^a See back, p. 361, "If the law of the State, &c." Prynne notes upon this passage, in his margin, "I pray inform me, Why a whole Parliament and Assembly of godly Christians and Divines, wherein are many of your own chief Independent ministers [and] members, should be more 'secular,' unclean, filthy, or unable to make a spiritual extraction of Church-government, than one of your Independent churches or conventicles?" P. 3.

^b P. 4.

^c Matt. xiii. 19.

^d Acts x. 35.

^e Luke x. 8.

^f Gen. ix. 27.

^g P. 5.

cries which the prelates ever used for the crying, and keeping up of their hierarchy, built upon the same sandy foundation? This is well noted in the Confession of Augsburg: 'These senate-like declamations, though they be very plausible, and incense the minds of many against us, yet they may be confuted by most true and substantial arguments:' as, 'all the prophets and apostles were true lovers of the peace and concord of nations and people, yet were they constrained, by the commandment of God, to war against the devil's kingdom, to preach heavenly doctrine, to collect a church unto God;' and the like: and 'the true doctrine of God and his true worship, must needs be embraced and received, and all errors that tend to the dishonour of God, must be abhorred and forsaken, though all the world should break and fall down:' and much more there.^a—6. Though we are fully persuaded, by God's Word and Spirit, that this our way is Christ's way, yet we neither do nor dare judge others to be reprobates that walk not with us in it, but we leave all judgment to God and heartily pray for them; we ourselves have been formerly ignorant of it, therefore we pity others.—7. Where you object that under pretence of christian liberty, whole houses, parishes, counties, may thus come to be divided into several forms of churches; as some for the presbyterial, some for the hierarchical, and so cause schisms and ruins, or 'at least, unavoidably subvert all ancient bounds of parishes, all settled maintenance for the ministry by tithes, etc.'...^b For difference of men's judgments in points of religion, how can it be avoided?.. It follows not that upon such differences, should come ruin to a State. What serveth the magistrate and the laws of a Civil State for, but to keep the peace?.. Are parishes, originally, any other but of human, politic, and civil constitution, and for civil ends? can you say, that so many as inhabit in every parish respectively, shall be a church? Should such churches and parishes, then, necessarily be churches of God's calling and gathering?.. And as for 'tithes;' what tithes, I pray you, had the apostles? Such as be faithful and painful ministers of Christ, he will certainly provide for; as when he sent forth his disciples without 'purse,' or provision, he asked them 'lacked ye any thing?' they said, 'nothing!'...^c Surely, 'the labourer is worthy of his hire.'^d For ministers' maintenance by tithes, I refer you to the judgment of your learned brother, Mr. Selden. And as for your 'Independent' ministers, they plead no other maintenance than the New Testament holds forth; yet not denying the magistrate and State a power to appoint maintenance for the preaching of the Word, as is done in New England, to those that are not members of churches: and where you charge them for having the faith of Christ in 'respect of persons,'^e as if they admitted the rich rather than the poor; brother, I hope it is not so with others; I am sure, not so with me! And, lastly, for your marginal *young* interrogatories;^f as

1. 'Of how many members, each congregation?' I am sure your congregations admit neither augmentation nor diminution, but according to the capacity of every parish!—2. 'Within what precincts?'

^a Harm. of Confess. sect. xi.

^d Luke x. 7.

^b P. 5.

^e Jas. ii. 1.

^c Luke xxii. 35.

^f P. 4.

Christ's churches are not limited either to place or number.—3. 'What stipends allowed?' sufficient, more or less.—4. 'When, and where, churches should assemble?' For 'when;' at times convenient: for 'where;' not necessarily in this or that place.—5. 'Who shall prescribe extraordinary times of fasting, or thanksgiving, to them, upon just occasions?' If the occasion be the church's peculiar interest, the church agrees upon the same: but if it be public, concerning the politic-body of the State whereof we are native members, in whose weal or woe we sympathize; either we keep days, of our own appointment, extraordinary, or if the civil state command and appoint a day, we refuse not to observe it.—6. 'Who shall rectify their church-covenants, discipline, censures, government, if erroneous or unjust?' Each church useth her best means, left her of Christ, within herself. If need require, she useth the help of sister-churches. If any other,—as the civil state,—be not satisfied, she 'refuseth not'^a to yield an account of her actions, being required.—7. 'Show us', say you, 'a sufficient satisfactory commission, from God's Word, for all they do or desire, before they gather any churches.' Brother Prynne, you say you will 'pump out our thoughts;' yea, it seems you will exantlate, pump out, every drop that is in us! But stay, brother, you are not yet a magistrate: and we hope you will not take up again the oath, *Ex Officio*, to pump out all our secrets. And though I have, for my part, dealt very freely with you as my brother, all along; yet give me leave to keep a reserve, *donec ad Triarios redierit res*—until it come to a dead list, in case we shall be brought before princes and rulers^b to give an account of what we 'do or desire.' You put us upon too unreasonable a task to satisfy you in all that we 'do' or 'desire!' First make your particular exceptions and demands for this or that; and then we shall know the better how to shape you an answer, as you see we have here done. What are all your books of law-cases, all the volumes of the casuists, to the resolution, upon general grounds, of incident matters which could not be ruled till they happened? And yet the government of states is one; and the doctrine of the Scripture, in all generally necessary points, clear. We 'desire' you not, too, too much to grow upon us when you see we are so coming and free!

"The fourth interrogatory; This is much like the next before, for that was about 'ministers' power to gather churches;' this, concerning 'the people's power in uniting themselves in a church; choosing their minister; erecting such a government as they conceive most suitable to the Scripture. And so, all manner of heretics may set up churches; and all manner of heresies [and] sects be brought in.'^c I answer as before: a church is a city of God, which by her Charter becomes a city, . . . and by the same Charter chooseth her own officers, etc. . . . Nor may we cast away the privileges of Christians because others abuse them: yea, whether we use our privileges, or not, errors and heresies will be; the apostles, and apostolic churches, could neither keep nor cast them out, as is showed before. But where you say that if this liberty of setting up an Independent church-government be admitted; 'then, by the self-same reason, they must have a like liberty to elect, erect, what

^a Acts xxv. 11.^b Matt. x. 18.^c P. 5.

civil form of government they please: to set up a new Independent republic, kingdom, etc.' ^a by the self-same reason! Surely, by no 'reason' at all: show us a 'reason' hereof, and take all! And you know that 'republics, kingdoms,' are Independent, though not of churches' electing, erecting. It is unsatisfiable injury, and extreme irrationality, thus to argue; for hath Christ given the same command to his people as such who are not 'of this world,' nor their 'kingdom,' as he hath done to them in spirituals, which he commands them to practise, whosoever forbids? They set up no form, but take what is *prescribed*; which God hath not done, in civil government, but left it free. ^b

"The fifth interrogatory: herein you make a comparison between Presbyterial and Independent churches... We desire to enjoy ours, without making comparison with yours... However you make us a conventicle, consisting of inconsiderable, ignorant, members; I believe when you shall have anything to do with the most contemptible of such conventicles as you esteem us, you will not altogether find us such as you are pleased to term us!... Where you would have them have the same power in a parliament, and synod, that they have in a church, if they be members; ^c it is answered, That all power is restrained to its own sphere and place, so that we may have a greater power in another kind and yet not that; as no parliament-man hath the power of a master of a family, in the parliament, though he have a greater.

"The sixth: this interrogatory hath sundry branches:... I desire brevity, and not to answer all your repetitions and aggravations. . .

"The seventh interrogatory is about the 'dismissing of members:' to become members of Presbyterial churches; or, of other Independent churches. ^d I answer, If any will desert their congregation, who can let [hinder] them? . . . If any shall repent and fall 'back;' churches are not more free than Christ himself was. ^e If any, for conveniency' sake, or necessary occasion, desire to join with some other church, do you think it unreasonable first to acquaint the Church with their desire? And, do you not allow of letters of recommendation when any is to pass to other churches? . . . We desire to do all things in love. . . You twit us again, for '*respecting* the rich more than the poor.' If it be true it is our fault, ^f and ought not so to be; if not true, it is yours, and that so often as you cast it in our dish.

"The eighth interrogatory: this, is to charge us for 'not admitting to baptism any infants of such parents who are not members of our churches:' ^g and, brother, you make this a most heinous and intolerable thing! Why, you know, if we would admit of all, it would be no small benefit to us; especially when we are to deal with rich men's children, such as you say we have in such 'high estimation?' Therefore, that we do it not for rich men, you may think there is something in it; that covetousness is not so predominant in us as to corrupt our consciences: and, therefore, let some charitable thought take place in you that we do it rather of conscience than of covetousness. And what say you to this, brother; we preach Christ to the parents; we preach him no less a king than a priest and prophet: we preach him the only king of our

^a P. 6.^b 1 Pet. ii.; Rom. xiii.^c P. 7.^d P. 7.^e John vi. 66.^f 1 Cor. xi. 22.^g P. 8.

conscience, and the only lawgiver and governor of his churches; we exhort them to set up this king in their hearts; we exhort them to become, and profess to be, those saints of whom he is king, for he is 'King of saints?'^a.. What would you have us to do in this case, baptize the infants of such parents as will not, in this respect, profess nor confess Christ to be their King?.. No infants have any title to baptism that are not within the covenant visibly, .. by virtue of their parents' faith outwardly professed. .. If, therefore, the parents profess not, yea refuse thus to be in visible covenant, can the children be said to be in visible covenant, and so to have a right to baptism, the external seal of the covenant? Brother, here is *obex*, a bar put! If you say, 'the child shall not bear the iniquity of the father;' true:.. but now, under the Gospel, those only are accounted Abraham's seed who profess the faith of Abraham, which faith looked upon Christ; and [which faith] embraceth whole Christ in all his offices, and [they in whose hearts it is] profess the same outwardly.^b So as the covenant is entailed only to believers now, and so to their children.^c If, then, the parents, by refusing Christ as their king, as the Jews did,^d do hereby cut themselves off from the covenant, they do therewith cut off their children too: and this, not to be recovered in the child, until either the parent be restored or the child coming, in time, to believe and to profess the faith of Christ, do hereby claim his right to the covenant and so to baptism, as being a child of Abraham. ..^e All societies require some promise of their members: if it be said, we are members of the universal church, by faith and repentance, we reply; .. Christ will not have his people to be wandering sheep when they may have a fold, nor to be *individua vaga*, when they may be reduced to order.

"The ninth interrogatory lays a charge upon Independents for 'refusing to admit to the Lord's supper such as are not notoriously scandalous nor grossly ignorant, but profess repentance, etc.;' which, you say, 'is a very uncharitable, arrogant, yea, unchristian practice, contrary to Christ's own example in admitting Judas to the Lord's supper:' also, to that of Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 28, you calling it, also, 'a transcendent strain of tyrannical usurpation over souls, and consciences, and God's ordinances; worse than our most domineering lordly prelates, etc., yea, lording over Christ himself, and more than ever the apostles did but only by their extraordinary calling, etc.'^f I answer in one word .. that we look further than to a general profession and conversation; namely, to their faith in Christ, that it be sound and whole. .. And what have they to do with the seals, that refuse by covenant to own Christ for their king? As for Judas, he received the sop, not the supper; for after the sop, he went out 'immediately,' saith John:^g so as it appears, the other evangelists relate some other passages by a *ὑστερον προτερον*, as is not unusual in Scripture story: and none of them saith that he received the supper. And suppose he did, the church's censure had not yet passed upon him: only John, by a secret sign, knew he was to be the traitor: For that of the apostle, 1 Cor. xi. 28, that was a true church, though now disordered; and the apostle refers the redressing of their

^a Rev. xv. 3.^b Rom. x. 9, 10.^c Acts ii. 39.^d Luke xix. 14.^e Rom. iv. 11, 16.^f P. 9.^g John xiii. 30.

abuses to themselves ! The case is otherwise here, so as all your accumulated calumniation fall to the ground. And concerning the apostles' 'extraordinary calling,' if we must expect the like calling we must not, in the mean time, admit of any either to baptism or to the Lord's supper ; neither should there be any gathering of churches at all ; as some from hence, do *gather* [logicè] : .. and what lawful gathering, then, have the Reformed churches ? For your marginal note of Moses, David, Solomon, 'about settling religion by God's own direction ;' herein you come home to that I said before, alleged against your unlimited law. But in that you now restrain, by their example, all 'church-government, to the civil magistrates ;' you must make it out by holding close to the rule, that is, 'to settle religion by God's own direction,' as you here confess ; and not 'to elect, erect,' a form of religion and church-government, such as they shall conceive 'suitable,' etc., as before you told us : and 'Moses, David, Solomon,' were all types of Christ, who put an end to all such. And while you there exclude the priests from having anything to do in 'reforming or advising,' what will the Assembly say to you ? But they may advise, you will say : but the priests might do nothing but according to God's prescript law, no more than 'Moses, David, Solomon.' And if the 'priests,' as you say, 'had no ruling votes,' then, by this reckoning, what votes do you allow the Assembly-men in their mixed committees with the members of Parliament, or in the Assembly itself ? Reconcile these, I pray you.

"The tenth interrogatory questions, or rather, as all the rest, concludes, that that text, Matt. xviii. 15—17, is not meant of any ecclesiastical censure, as of excommunication, but only of the 'civil court of justice.'^a Brother, if you did speak here as a divine, and not merely as a lawyer, you would not have .. so interpreted this place. What speak I of divines ; the text itself is its own clearest interpreter ; ver. 18 : which is, without controversy, spoken of church-censure, or of the power of 'the Keys' in exercising church-discipline ; as that, Matt. xvi. 19, is spoken of *doctrine*, as the learned Calvin well observeth : so as this very context cleareth the former to be meant of church-censures, as it was among the Jews. . . Good brother, I could wish that all this zeal of yours, against Independents, might not arise from any jealousy, as if church-censures should prejudicate or trench upon your pleadings at the bar of civil justice ! Far be it, that *we* should have our motion beyond our own sphere : content *yourself* with your own orb, and we shall confine ourselves to ours, I dare warrant you. Again ; to what purpose do you urge this interpretation of this text against us ? Do not all the Presbyterians expound it so ? And if this text, which is made the great pillar of Presbyterian excommunication, be taken off, you leave no more to a classis than we [do], *scilicet*, to consult and advise ! And with this foot, you have dashed all the milk you gave them.

"The eleventh interrogatory : This is to persuade us that in that Assembly, or 'Evangelical Synod,' as you call it, 'Acts xv., the apostles voted not as they were apostles, infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost, but rather as they were in their ordinary capacity, as elders and chief members of it.'^b Whereupon, producing your six reasons for it,

^a P. 10.^b P. 10.

you peremptorily conclude, that 'this is an undeniable Scripture-authority for the lawfulness, use, of parliaments, councils, synods, under the Gospel, upon all like necessary occasions; and for their power to determine controversies of religion, to make canons in things necessary for the church's peace and concernment, maugre all evasions, exceptions,' of Independents 'to elude it.'... Why the apostles sate not as apostles, but as ordinary elders, etc.; we lay this ground for the contrary, *scil.*, That they sate as apostles; because not [no] ordinary elders, as elders, can say, 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us;' but the apostles, as apostles, might say so; because, in any doctrinal point, they had the promise of 'the Spirit' to be led 'into all truth,'^a as upon whom the church was to be built.^b If they sate as ordinary elders, then their decrees did no further bind than as they might appear to agree with Scripture; otherwise, elders as elders may bind the conscience, let the decree be never so wicked!... Though the apostles might have done it alone, yet they would not, but called together the elders and brethren, yea, and 'the whole church' at Jerusalem;^c hereby to give a precedent to all presbyters, or elders of churches, that in cases of difference arising, they call 'the whole church' together for assistance and counsel therein. In so doing, the apostles diminished nothing of that judicial power and authority which Christ left with them for deciding of controversies, being infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost; while they thought it not fit to do such things, in a corner, which concerned 'the whole church.'... But, good brother, for all your punctual quotations of that Scripture, you do not, all this while, tell us—which is the main of all—that which we find in the 28th verse of Acts xv... We challenge you to show us any 'parliament, council, synod,' ever since the apostles, that could or can say thus, 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and us,'—'to determine controversies of religion, to make and impose canons to bind all men, etc.'... Never let any man press upon us that Scripture, that synod, which hath no parallel in the whole world; and so is no precedent, pattern, for any 'council, synod, parliaments!... Bellarmine, upon the same Scripture you allege,^d—as also our late prelates have usually done,—would deduce the same conclusion that you do for human authority in binding men's consciences: to which, Chamierus thus answereth, That this consequence holds not; 'because there is not the same authority of the apostles and of other pastors of the church; for, with those the Holy Ghost was extraordinarily present, so as what they propounded did simply proceed of God: but other pastors have no such extraordinary assistance of the Spirit; and, therefore, their decrees are not to be paralleled with the apostles' decrees. Which is a special difference in binding of the conscience, which hath itself for witness and God for the only judge; therefore, when it hath anything commanded of God, it must needs stand bound.'^e Where—inter cætera—is to be noted, That

^a John xvi. 13.^b Eph. ii. 20.^c Acts xv. 4, 22.^d Acts xv.^e Panstratiæ Catholicæ; tom. iii. De libertate Christiana, lib. xv. cap. x. De pohibitis Idolothytis, sanguine, et suffocato. "Illis aderat extra ordinem Spiritus Sanctus, &c."

God is the 'only judge' and binder of the conscience ! the great question in controversy at this day. But you will here object, That, although,—as before you say of priests,—a council, or synod, have not this authority to make and impose binding decrees, yet a parliament hath ! And you deduce it from this synod, Acts xv. Now, truly, brother, by your favour, this doth no way hold proportion, That that which you call a 'synod,'—as a pattern for binding decrees,—should not qualify a synod of divines with the like power ; and yet [you] transmit it over to a 'parliament' for binding authority over the consciences of a whole nation ! Surely, that apostolic assembly, or church-meeting, was neither a parliament, nor diet, nor senate, nor any such thing ; that you should build any such power of 'parliaments' upon it : . . . therefore, good brother, be not so peremptory, but take in your top-sail ; too high to bear up against so stiff a gale both of Scripture and reason.

" But I come to your twelfth and last interrogatory : this is concerning the 'lawful coercive power of civil magistrates in suppressing heresies, etc. ;' or, 'setters-up of new forms of ecclesiastical government, etc.'^a For answer hereunto : . . . For a man's practices, of which alone man can take cognizance, if they be against any of God's commandments of the first or second table, *that* appertains to the civil magistrate to punish ; who is, for this cause, called 'custos utriusque tabulæ, The keeper of both tables :' and, therefore, the apostle saith, 'For rulers are not a terror to good *works*, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power ? *do* that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same : for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou *do* that which is evil, be afraid ; for he beareth not the sword in vain : for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that *doeth* evil.'^b So as we see, here, what is the object of civil power ; to wit, *actions*, good or bad : not bare opinions, not thoughts, not conscience, but *actions* : and yourself exempts the preaching of the Gospel and Truth of God, from being restrained by the civil magistrate. But now, brother, the time hath been, and somewhere is, and will be, that 'the Truth' of God hath been withholden 'in unrighteousness ;'^c and, by the civil magistrate, punished with death ; being condemned for heresy ! And you see, in these days, great diversities of men's opinions and judgments. . . . You think my way erroneous ; and I may do as much for you : . . . but so long as we differ only in opinion, which of us shall be punished first ; or which of us is in the error ? you write books, I write against them ; yet, sub judice lis est, who shall be judge, you or I ? Surely, neither ! Among other things, you would have the civil magistrate . . . 'to suppress, restrain, imprison, confine, banish, the setters-up of *new* forms of ecclesiastical government, without lawful authority.'^d But what, if I prove that which you call a 'new' form, to be the old form ; and the 'lawful authority' of setting it up to be of Christ ? . . . You may be a civil judge one day ; remember then, brother, that, if I come before you, you meddle not with my conscience, nor with me for it. . . . So ends your book ; and so my answer !

^a P. 11.^b Rom. xiii. 3, 4.^c 2 Thess. ii. 12.^d P. 12.

“Now, brother, you have since published a third book;^a partly in answer to your first answerer,^b and partly touching Mr. John Goodwin. I leave the parties interested to acquit themselves; only your stating the question, in the conclusion of the book, I could not omit: ‘Whether a whole representative church and state hath not a great, or greater, ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole realm and churches, with all the members, than any one Independent minister or congregation challenge over their members?..’ If the ‘jurisdiction’ of the churches you call ‘Independent’ be good, as having Christ for the founder and owner of it,—as we have clearly proved,—then, certainly, *it* will prove the greater; for magna est veritas, et prevalebit: Christ’s kingdom shall stand up when all opposite, earthly, kingdoms, like earthen vessels, shall, with His iron rod, be dashed in pieces. This for the clause. Another passage, in the same book, is touching my person; where you say, ‘that none of us three brethren-sufferers suffered for opposing bishops’ legal authority; or any ceremonies, by act of parliament established.’.. I openly, for the space almost of a twelve-month, immediately before my troubles, preached.. every Lord’s day out of Col. ii. 8—23; so as when I was summoned into the High Commission Court, the articles read against me were not only for my two sermons, Nov. 5th, but also for those other sermons against the Ceremonies... And concerning my opposing of Bishops themselves; not only their extravagancies, for which I also was censured, and suffered; you may remember one passage, in that book ‘For God and the King,’ affixed to the Information, ‘Were there a law in England, as once among the Locrians, that who should come to propound a new law he should come with a rope about his neck; I would be the first, myself, to petition the parliament that the government of bishops might be abolished, and another set up more agreeable to the Scripture.’..^c I confess, were I to make such a proposition now, I should as much alter my style as the condition of this present time differs from that: I should mount much higher! And do you not think, brother, that this helped to put the hangman’s knife—though not the ‘halter’—so close to the very roots of my ears, that it opened the wider sluices for the blood to stream out—with yours, my dear fellow-sufferers,—to fill the Whore’s ‘cup?’..^d Although the more cautelous and self-wise, or discreet, any of us, but especially myself, then was, to avoid the ‘fear’ of men^e or force of law, certainly now, brother, it abates so much the more of the honour of that suffering; and the less honour, the more shame... Let us now make it up, by being zealous for our Christ in

^a “A full Reply to ‘Certain Brief Observations and Anti-Queries on Master Prynne’s Twelve Questions about Church Government:’ Wherein the Frivolousness, Falseness, and Gross Mistakes, of this Anonymous Answerer—ashamed of his Name,—and his Weak Grounds for Independency, or Separation, are modestly discovered, refuted. By William Prynne, of Lincoln’s Inn, Esq. Lond. 1644.” 4to. pp. 24. This “third book,” spoken of by Burton, was replied to under the title of “A Modest Answer to Mr. Prynne’s ‘Full Reply,’ &c. 1645.” 4to.

^b Supposed to be Henry Robinson, in p. 4, 6, &c. of Prynne’s “Vindication of Four Serious Questions of Grand Importance, concerning Excommunication, &c. 1645.” 4to.

^c See back, vol. i. p. 555.

^d Rev. xvii. 4.

^e Prov. xxix. 25.

labouring to advance the throne of his Kingly government, in all our souls, and over all the churches of the saints; and, with those 'four-and-twenty elders,' cast ourselves and crowns before Him that sitteth 'on the throne,'^a saying, 'Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power,' for evermore: Amen. And let this be our main contention, Who shall most honour Christ, and most love one another! Farewell."

CHAP. LVI.

APOLLONIJ.—BAILLIE.

MUCH of the matter which will immediately follow the particulars of the piece about to be examined here, will be greatly increased in interest by juxtaposition, notwithstanding the apparent discrepancy in dates. At present we have to do with "A Consideration of Certain Controversies at this time agitated in the Kingdom of England, Concerning the Government of the Church of God. Written, at the Command and Appointment of the Walachrian Classis, by Guilielmus Apollonij, Minister of the Word of God at Middleburgh. And sent from the Walachrian Churches, to declare the sense and consent of their Churches, to the Synod at London. Octob. 16, 1644. *Stilo novo*.—Translated out of Latin according to the printed copy.^b Lond. 1645." 16mo. pp. 151.

The Dedication, dated Nov. 1, 1644, is set out with the styles and titles of three "Most excellent, most noble, magnificent, and most illustrious Lords" of the United Provinces of the Netherlands; and they are told in the name of the chief author, that "The Pastors of the Churches of the Walachrian Classis, being moved with the deplorable face and condition of the English Churches, would gladly contribute some assistance for the quenching of that flame of controversies risen amongst them, concerning the Discipline and Spiritual Government of the Kingdom of Christ; and afford not their prayers only, but their counsel and assistance also, meet for composing these contentions, whereby the billows of dissensions might be assuaged, and happy peace restored to those troubled churches. By their authority, therefore, and command, they have employed me in this present work; and out of pure zeal and brotherly love to those churches, have lately enjoined me to exhibit to the Assembly of Divines at London our Ecclesiastical Government, proved by the Word of God, and confirmed by the grounds of holy Scripture and the consent of Reformed divines. Which work being now finished, and, after a diligent examination by those Pastors, approved, I offer to your most noble and most excellent Lordships."..

^a Rev. iv. 10.

^b "Consideratio quarundam Controversiarum, ad Regimen Ecclesiæ spectantium quæ in Angliæ Regno hodie agitantur: ex mandato et jussu Classis Walachrianæ conscripta. Lond. 1644." 16mo. pp. 180.

This is followed by an Epistle "To the Synod at London," dated as on the title-page.

"Reverend and Beloved Brethren in Christ,—We have received by your most courteous Letters, written, some months since, to the Churches of Zealand, an express testimony not only of your entire friendship, but also of your confidence and sincere affection towards us, into whose bosom you were pleased to pour forth your fluctuating minds. . . O that our eyes were resolved into fountains of waters, that we might lament, day and night, the desolations of the people! Our mind trembles to hear the desperate counsels and wicked attempts of those whose endeavour hath been to blot out from amongst you the whole face of a Reformed Church, and totally to hinder all better counsels; and have brought it thus to pass, that the band of the kingdom being broken, all things are now involved in a cruel war; all hope of peace and agreement taken away, and the happiness of church and kingdom overthrown. But, as God doth by his favour prosper right counsels, so, for the most part, he brings the wicked plots of men upon the heads of those who contrive them. . . We pray, therefore, that He who knoweth what is conducing to the good of mankind, of his church, of you, would vouchsafe to inspire such counsels into the hearts of Princes which may restore to you godliness, together with holy agreement and prosperity; since we see we have nothing but prayers left for the assuaging the floods of troubles amongst you. . . God hath sent a fire into your lands, not to consume the golden and precious vessels of the Lord, but to purify the sons of Levi, and to cleanse his house from the dross and filth of false and adulterate worship, superstition, schisms, errors and offences; that there be offered, in all your borders, a pure offering of spiritual worship according to God's institution. For how great a thing are we to judge this, that these troubles of your churches have produced this holy 'Covenant' between the three kingdoms, . . and engaged you all really, constantly, sincerely, and to your utmost power, to labour and endeavour to defend and maintain the Reformed religion of the Church of Scotland . . against the common enemies: . . as likewise to bring the churches of God in these three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in the Confession of Faith, Form of Church-Government, Directory for Divine Worship, and Form of Catechism; that all you, and your posterity after you, may as brethren live in the true faith and mutual love, and that the Lord may be pleased to dwell in the midst of you. . . We beseech you, therefore, in the Name of God, that—denying all human affections, you deal faithfully in this business—you do wholly cast forth of the House of God not only the Bishops' tyranny, and superstitions already suppressed, but also heresies and schisms, and whatsoever is contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness, as your oath asserteth. . . Unless you do timely withstand the spreading gangrene of Separatists, and the unlawful conventicles of schismatics, farewell all sacred discipline of the church, due policy, and spiritual government! We have had experience, in the troubles of our churches, of the subtilty of those who, being day and night intent on innovating, leave no stone unmoved; go to and fro by sea, by land, to gain disciples and patrons

of their cause ; and so, at last, by force and fear, curb and oppress the Cause of Truth and of God. The remedy comes too late, when evils have gotten strength by long delays : the heavenly affairs of the church go to ruin, when, by worldly reasonings of human wisdom, they are protracted, abated, retarded ; settled and unsettled. . . You must therefore speedily withstand their designs at first. . . Lord Jesus ! digest this chaos of confusions ; let thy Spirit spread itself upon these waters of evil fluctuating opinions. Thou, by thy Spirit, hast reconciled earth and heaven ; by it Thou hast joined so many tongues, nations, and several sorts of men, into one body of the church, which, by the same Spirit, is knit fast to Thee her Head ; vouchsafe, therefore, to renew that Spirit in the hearts of our Brethren, that all these confusions and calamities may cease amongst them, and may tend to the advantage of godliness to thy church.

“ Reverend Brethren, We are desirous to repay you our debts. When our country was on a flame, by the intestine dissensions about religion, by your help, counsel and assistance, were our wounds healed, our griefs assuaged : when you, therefore, lie under the same disease, we labour, in way of gratitude, to heal you : this is our end ; this is that we aim at. . . We join, therefore, with these Letters, our judgment concerning certain controversies now agitated in your kingdom : . . not that we would call you to give an account at our tribunal ; far be it from us ; for we acknowledge that there are amongst you, and those Brethren who maintain the contrary part in these controversies, men learned, godly, lovers of peace, who are abundantly sufficient in judging, explaining, and deciding all these controversies ; but, in quenching a common flame in a city, they, not without cause, run to help, even uncalled, whose neighbour’s house is on fire ! . . You have called upon us, in your most courteous Letters, that we would be helpful to you, in your shaken condition, by such remedies as by our common advice should be thought meet ; and we have judged it at this time most suitable to show to you who are in conflict, your diseases and their remedies ; to signify the practice and laws observed by our churches in their spiritual government and public worship of God, and to vindicate them by the Word of God against the erroneous conceits of *some*. Of ‘some,’ we say, for we are assured that the whole body of the church is not yet infected with this ulcer. And therefore what we have gathered out of the public writings daily published amongst you, we desire not to impute to any but those who defend, nourish, and maintain, those perverse opinions, or receive them into their churches. If some of those Brethren of the contrary opinion do in ought differ from them, we wish they would declare so much by public writing, and express it by common consent ; that the Reformed churches of Christ might be freed from the just fear which their writings have caused them to conceive. For, not without cause do the godly conceive that those are hatching some monster, that use shifts and dare not with open face clearly set down and maintain their opinions. Therefore, by the name of Christ and the love of the Spirit, we beseech those Brethren, that they would clearly, sincerely, plainly, and distinctly, without the vizard of rhetorical flourishes, declare and describe to us their Ecclesiastical Policy and

form of public worship; not here and there a piece, but in the whole frame of it: and, that they would not vent doubtful expressions in public, but, in due order, which tendeth to edification, manifest it to the Reformed churches of Christ, if there be ought deficient in their Ecclesiastical government; that with a peaceable, brotherly mind, and in due manner, the Truth may be searched out, and held forth in public to the eyes of all.".. "Subscribed, in the name of the Walachrian Churches, by us, Jacobus D'Herde, President of the Walachrian Classis, *pro tempore*: Iodocus Larenus, Assessor, *pro temp.*: Isaacus Hoornbekius, Preacher at Middleburgh: Cornelius Beuckelarius, Preacher at Vere: Melchior Burs, Minister of West Souburch."

The topics said to have been considered by these several oracles, inquired of by an active knot of confederates, and professedly "moved" at the "deplorable" grounds of the solicitation, concern—The qualifications of Church Members: The absolute necessity of a Church Covenant: The kinds of an instituted Visible Church: The depositories of Ecclesiastical Power: The supremacy of the Ecclesiastical Ministry; and the Exercise thereof, in three particulars: Classes and Synods, and their Authority: Set Forms of Prayer.

The sum of their judgment, regarding the first head, or chapter, is, "We affirm, that to the external and visible church, the pastors are to admit those who profess the true religion and faith of Christ, lead their lives without scandal, or being fallen into scandals, do by repentance wash them away *in foro ecclesiæ*—at the church's tribunal,—submit themselves to discipline, publicly frequent all exercises of divine worship, and desire church-communion with us; although they do not manifest such evident signs of regeneration which may convince the consciences of the church of their true faith in Christ."^a They state honestly the diversity of practice among themselves: "In our Reformed churches of the Netherlands, members of churches are admitted by a confession of the true faith and religion, a solemn protestation to submit themselves to the discipline of the church, a testimony of an unblamable and inoffensive life: as also Ames himself affirmeth, that 'men are duly admitted into the church by a confession of faith and promise of obedience.'^b And, in some more numerous churches in the Netherlands, it is the custom and practice, for the churches' greater prudence in admitting members, that those who desire admission into church-communion before their solemn profession of faith, are, for some weeks, several times privately exercised; and instructed, if they be not sufficiently exercised. And this instruction is by the ministers, in the visitation of their several precincts; and is also publicly offered to all, when notice is given of celebrating the Lord's supper. The ministers inquire, likewise, of the integrity of life and conversation of those who expect communion with us: afterwards they use to undergo an examination before the consistory in their consistorial meeting, or before the delegates of the consistory; which is performed by the minister through all the points of catechism: and, last of all, having been thus tried, they do in public, before the body of the church, by a bare

^a P. 3.^b Medulla, Lib. i. cap. xxxii. thes. 17.

affirmation, give answer to these general positions, ‘Whether or not they acknowledge the doctrine of our churches to be the orthodox faith and the way of salvation? Whether or not they promise, by the grace of God, to persist till death in the profession of this doctrine? Whether or not they promise to live holily and as becometh this doctrine? Whether or not they submit themselves to the discipline of the church?’ In this manner are those who desire admission admitted to our church-communion. This *custom*, though laudable, is not indeed contrary, but yet is beside the *order* of our churches, and is not in use in all our churches; which therefore we do not urge as absolutely necessary, but make use of it for the greater ecclesiastical prudence in so grave and serious a matter. In the mean time we esteem that *order* established in our ecclesiastical constitutions to be sufficient for the due admitting of members into church-communion, according to the Word of God.”^a

Under the second chapter, they say, “Our churches of the Netherlands, in admitting of pastors or church-members, do not enter into any such church-covenant; which yet are true visible churches of God.”^b And afterward, “We hold that the sacraments are to be administered, not to those only who by a church-covenant have joined themselves to some particular church, but to all the members of the church-catholic who have duly prepared themselves for the partaking of them. Thus our Belgic churches deny not the seal of baptism to the children of those parents who have not, by a confession of faith and submission to ecclesiastical discipline, joined themselves to any particular church; according to the practice of the Jewish church, Joshua v. 4, 6: as neither do we deny the participation of the Lord’s supper to those who by reason of the necessity of their calling cannot join themselves to any particular church, but are forced to travel through divers parochial churches.”^c

The third chapter informs us, that “In our Belgic churches in some greater towns, though there be more believers than can celebrate the holy worship of God and exercise other ordinances of Christ together in one place, yet they are not divided into several churches, but do together make one visible church, under the common presbytery and government of divers pastors.”^d They say, “We reject that national and provincial form of a church introduced by men, in which many churches are united and subjected to a cathedral church, and depend upon one visible pastor, who is pastor and lord of all other pastors and inferior particular churches; wherein the inferior churches enjoy God’s holy ordinances and ecclesiastical power by derivation and commission from the power and jurisdiction of that cathedral church, or that national or provincial pastor and bishop. For these are the inventions of Antichrist, which bring a tyranny into the church, and overthrow the power granted by God to the churches and pastors. Yet such a national and provincial church we acknowledge wherein many particular churches are, by one visible ministry and church-government, joined into one collective ecclesiastical body visible, for celebrating all those

^a P. 11—13.^b P. 19.^c P. 23.^d P. 27.

ordinances of God which are necessary to the visible ministerial government of those churches, and mutual ecclesiastical fellowship in it.”^a “We affirm that a company of presbyters met together with ecclesiastical jurisdiction for transacting church affairs, are a church; to wit, a ministerial or a governing and representative church, as they call it; and therefore called in Scripture by the name ‘church.’ We confess that such a company of presbyters are not a church-representative, properly so called; as if the elders were the delegates of the believers, who in their name and their stead govern the church, and judge of church affairs, so as that the company of believers govern and judge by those elders as their instruments and deputies, like as the king’s deputy represents the king himself. For the multitude of believers in the church hath not, by the Word of God, a power of ruling and judging church affairs by a spiritual jurisdiction; and therefore cannot delegate it to the elders and presbyters: but the presbyters do themselves immediately from Christ, the King of the church, receive power of ruling, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction; 2 Cor. v. 20; 1 Cor. iv. 1. In this sense, therefore, we do not acknowledge a representative church. Neither do we acknowledge such a representative church as, by commission from the multitude of believers, should have absolute power by their laws and acts of jurisdiction to bind the multitude, and subject their faith and consciences so as, without trial, they should receive and embrace whatsoever should be determined by this church: for this is the papists’ tyrannical antichristian representative church, in the pope and his popish bishops; which, by Reformed churches, is denied and cast out. But this representative church we acknowledge out of the holy Scriptures, namely, a company of presbyters chosen by the multitude of the church, which, by authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction received from Christ, is set over and takes care of the church, and rules it by spiritual jurisdiction, and decrees made consonant to the Word of God; to whom the whole multitude of believers is bound to yield obedience in all things which, from the Word of God, and by the power of Christ committed to them, they decree.”^b

“We reject, therefore, these opposite opinions following: 1. That there is no other church-visible described in Scripture, but a particular or parochial church, which might meet together in one place to celebrate the holy worship of God. For there is such a visible church described in Scripture which hath those attributes given to it which agree not to a particular church as such; as that it is dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,—1 Pet. i. 1, compared with chapter v. 1, 2,—that ‘all,’ both Jews and Greeks, whether bond or free, make up ‘one body’ thereof: 1 Cor. xii. 13. 2. That a particular visible church is, by the Word of God, limited to such bounds as that, of necessity, they may be ordinarily contained, and ought to meet in one place, for performing the worship of God with mutual edification.—For we have showed that the constitution of such a church as, by reason of their multitude or some other cause, cannot ordinarily meet in one place, doth well agree with the word of God and apostolical institution: for the essence and lawful constitution of a

^a P. 28.^b P. 37.

church dependeth not on the outward circumstance of place, but on a due profession of faith and bond of holy communion; for, as Ames saith, 'That same, in profession, doth constitute a church-visible, which, in reality and its internal nature, constituteth the church-mystical, that is, faith.'^a 3. That there is no visible instituted church, but that which is met together for the performance of all the ecclesiastical ordinances of Christ; for preaching the Word of God, and administration of the sacraments, and the exercise of all the offices and spiritual gifts, in a constituted church.—But Christ speaketh of a 'church,' Matt. xviii. 17, met together, not for the Word and sacraments, but only for the exercise of church-discipline. So, likewise, is that meeting called a 'church' wherein the apostles did not, by way of sermon, preach the Word, nor administer the sacraments, but only told what God had done among the Gentiles, Acts xiv. 27; xv. 4; or chose some to carry their decrees to others, xv. 22, which were acts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. And, therefore, that meeting which meeteth only for the exercise of discipline and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, is also a 'church,' and so called in Scripture."^b

The fourth chapter enlarges upon the topic in which was laid the real ground of contention, and of which the two following chapters are but expository. "To all the members of the church belongeth power to *choose* their ministers: . . . but, by this election, the believers do not confer or derive the power of the Keys on the ministers or pastors chosen; but only design him on whom the power of that church-office is, by Divine institution, to be conferred by ecclesiastical ordination. . . . The act of election, or nomination, is not an act of jurisdiction or ecclesiastical authority; but of the gift of discretion, whereby they prove the spirits, and discern the voice of the shepherd, and choose him by whose teaching they will be led."^c "In this whole business, therefore, of vocation, we grant to the people nomination; which was, at first, [!] in the power of the presbyters and people in common."^d "It is clear by apostolical examples and the practice of the ancients, that the ministers were first to nominate, and the people to assent to that nomination duly performed, or to consult in common about the person to be nominated; or lastly, if they have any cause why they might justly oppose that nomination, freely to produce their judgment to the governors of the church."^e It is no part of ours, to reconcile these conflicting passages; we merely produce them. Again: "All this business of election doth not constitute any one a pastor; . . . for the people's nomination and the whole matter of election may be rightly performed, and yet it may so come to pass that he which is chosen by a people may never be their pastor: to wit, if the person elected do justly refuse it; or the presbytery duly determine the person elected to be unfit for the ministry of this people. . . . Ordination therefore, contains in it the potestative mission whereby, according to Divine appointment, a pastor receiveth the ecclesiastical office. Which mission, or sending, is so necessary that without it no man may duly undertake an ecclesiastical office: Rom. x. 15."^f

^a Medulla, Lib. i. cap. xxxii. thes. 7.

^d P. 47.

^e *Ib.*

^b P. 41—43.

^c P. 45, 46.

^f P. 48, 49, 50.

The following passage seems to accord only to the figure in rhetoric, called 'oxymoron,'—where contradictions meet. "The government of the church or kingdom of Christ is free and voluntary, to which all the children of the church do voluntarily submit themselves: but yet it is a government, properly so called; for there is in it authoritative jurisdiction, and ecclesiastical coercion by spiritual punishments on the soul. In reference to the former,—that this government is voluntary,—the whole people by their free and voluntary consent and agreement, do concur to the election of the governors of the church and the excommunication of members. But in reference to the latter,—that the government of the church is properly government,—the whole people doth not rule or govern in the church; but the church is divided into rulers and those that are ruled: and therefore, only the guides and rulers of churches, in ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are Christ's vice-gerents to rule, and in his name, to command; to judge, and by Christ's censures, to correct. The power of ecclesiastical office hath, therefore, in the government of the church, over and above the people's consent, an authoritative and coercive power of the discipline and rod of Christ, which belongeth not to the people."^a See, however, 2 Cor. ii. 6, opposed to 1 Cor. iv. 21, and 2 Cor. xiii. 10.

"We deny not," say these Wallachrian guides, "but that extraordinarily, in a perplexed and depraved estate of a whole visible church, the multitude, or faithful people, in a church, may choose their pastors and rulers; and authoritatively put them into the power, right, and possession of the ministry; and that, by reason of a cogent necessity which admitteth no law, and to which all positive law giveth place."^b After this, they say, "We in this cause do, from the holy Scriptures, thus judge, . . . That the multitude of believers in a church, by this nomination or designation of a person on whom it may according to Christ's institution be duly conferred, doth effect thus much, That the ecclesiastical office and the power thereof, by the donation of Christ, may be applied to this or that man; but doth not derive this power on that person."^c

We come now to the completion of the hypothesis, without which the previous reasoning cannot stand, and must therefore, be sustained even before the face of manifest inconsistency. "'You,' saith the apostle, 'and my spirit, being gathered together in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, with the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, let such a man be delivered to Satan:' 1 Cor. v. 4, 5; and this rebuke, or church-censure, was done *ὑπὸ τῶν πλείονων*, 'by [the] many,' as he writes, 2 Cor. ii. 6. Surely, that by these 'many' the apostle understandeth not the whole multitude, is easily manifested: if all were present at the deliberating, every one even of the meanest capacity may see there was no reason why Paul should not have written *ὑπο τῶν πάντων*, 'of all;' for this had been very suitable to commend that cause which the apostle was urging. For from the multitude of those who had by ecclesiastical discipline corrected the incestuous person, he endeavours to prevail with the Corinthians, that they would now afford pardon to him upon his repentance. And further, let

^a P. 51.^b P. 57.^c P. 61.

it be remembered that these *πλείονες*, these 'many,' are described, in the former place, to be *συναχθέντες ὑμῶν δυνάμει τῷ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* 'gathered together with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ,' 1 Cor. v. 4. For since we know that this 'power' is by Christ committed to the ministry of the church, and lies in the administration of the spiritual keys, we may easily guess that by the term 'many' is to be understood the company of pastors and elders to whom the care of ecclesiastical discipline is committed."^a This rotten theory is propped up with the aid of Bullinger and Hyperius upon the text; by the first indeed more confidently than by the second.

The fifth and sixth chapters contain concessions materially affecting the restrictive policies which these worthy referees strive to defend. "We grant . . . that private Christians in an extraordinary case, in a church to be erected, or that is decayed and ruined, may sometimes publicly preach the Word of God for the planting a church, when there are not such as by God's ordinary call, have received from God power to preach the Word: for the positive ritual law of God gives place to the moral law of God when necessity requires it."^b So also, "in a case extraordinary, when a national church is corrupted and depraved, the due power of classes and synods overturned and destroyed; and when the polity of the church is so utterly ruined as that there is no more any face of it to be seen, nowhere any to be found that labour in sound doctrine, no marks of a visible church discernible by the eyes of men; in such a case, the ordination of pastors is in the power of the particular church, who have received from God, right to ordain, in this necessity, by their own eldership. And therefore, where there is no such eldership, they first go about the constitution of it, and then being thus constituted, they perform their ordinations by it. For that is sure which Melancthon doth oft inculcate; 'When the ordinary bishops,' saith he, 'become enemies to the church, or refuse to afford ordination, the churches retain their own right; for wherever there is a church, there is power of dispensing the gospel: so that of necessity the church must retain a right of their own, to call, elect, and ordain ministers; and this right is a gift granted to the church, which no human authority can take from it.'^c That this power should be wholly abrogated, and brought to nothing for want of pastors, is not to be thought; but common sense teacheth that it is better, in such a case, to enlarge it, than that the church should be destitute of the large fruits of the gospel's preaching: for that the church should be then deprived of this power when the exercise of it is most chiefly required, is absurd."^d

The seventh and last chapter admits the convenience of Set Forms of Prayer, and grounds their lawfulness on the common-place arguments, that "we may, in a prescript form, sing psalms, and offer thanksgivings to God with due reverence, faith, spiritual affection and zeal:" that "that is a just and lawful form of prayers in which are observed the essentials and necessary requisites to all prayers:" that "our Lord and Saviour Christ hath prescribed us a form of prayer; . . . an express form of baptising;" that Jewish forms, "in the celebration of the passover,

^a P. 64.^b P. 77.^c Argum. et Respons. Pt. vii. De potest. Episc. Arg. 2.^d P. 107.

Christ by his practice did approve to be retained ;” that “so likewise, our Saviour hath, by his example, prescribed a form of words for the Lord’s supper, Matt. xxvi:” and, lastly, “in *almost* all Reformed churches ecclesiastical liturgies and forms of prayers are approved as useful and conducing to the edification of the church.”^a “Nowhere hath God commanded that a Christian should separate himself from that worship which is performed by a prescript form : . . . and we think it uncharitable, to condemn all those godly churches as guilty of superstition and will-worship, which, from the times of the apostles and the primitive churches downward, even to this day, have celebrated the public worship of God in prescript and set-forms. And therefore we blame the precise singularity of those men who banish all set forms from the worship of God, and separate themselves from all the Protestant churches into private and separate congregations of their own, because of the forms used by the Protestants in the worship of God.”^b Here, in these their last words, the Walachrian censors, could go no further in their commission than to say “we think it uncharitable,” and, “we blame the precise singularity ;” phrases but little satisfactory, we imagine, to those who solicited their judgment of the Separatists ; who are, after all, unfairly represented, to separate themselves merely “because of the forms used by the Protestants !” and how unfairly, they have themselves shown, in a paragraph which we reserved to follow at this place, the more effectively to prove, by another instance, their inconsistency, and to mitigate even their qualified censure of those whom they were appointed in particular to condemn.

Thus then they wrote, seven pages backward, “We reject such forms of prayer, of administration of sacraments, etc., which for the matter of them are vicious. For we may not, in prayers and other parts of the public worship of God, propound anything unlawful, impertinent, and unfitting ; which savoureth of superstition, idolatry or heresy, or carnal profaneness and pomp of the world ; and which introduceth a communion with the unfruitful works of darkness. And for this cause we reject the ceremonies and forms of public worship introduced in the Church of England in these last corrupt times, by the hierarchical Bishops ; as which, being superstitious and idolatrous, did deface the church and worship of God, and obscure the brightness and beauty of a glorious Reformation : and a church which takes up superstitious and idolatrous ceremonies, partakes in superstition and idolatry.—We reject also, those forms of prayers and public worship which, by a tyrannical and violent command, are imposed on the consciences of men as absolutely necessary, and as essential parts of God’s worship. Though, for the matter of them, they be legitimately disposed ; yet for the form of them and the manner of their introducing, they become illegitimate instruments of cruelty, and pretences for perverse wickedness, and occasions of violent tyranny against the worthiest and best sons of the Church. For there are not, by Christ or the apostles—whose institutions are not defective in the absolutely necessary parts of God’s worship—any forms prescribed as simply and absolutely necessary, wherein they have drawn up an exact and immutable rule for all Chris-

^a P. 146—150.^b P. 151.

tians in churches, in matter, and form, and method, to which all faithful worshippers of God to the world's end are to be precisely bound!"^a

At this place, the further produce of Baillie's pen^b will continue the exposure of the underhand practices^c to which he and his party resorted, and present other matter contributory to the history of the period to which they relate.

"The other day some of the Dutch church^d came to the assembly-door, and delivered a Letter to us, from the Classes of Walachren. It was publicly read, and taken with a great deal of respect. It came wonderful opportunely, and will do a great deal of good. The long and sharp censure of the Apologetic Narration was very well received by all, but the parties, who yet were altogether silent and durst not oppose one word. A committee was presently appointed for translating it into English, and transmitting it to be read to both houses of parliament, both in Latin and English. What there it may work, you shall hear in time. It spoke so near to the mind and words of the Scots, that some said it savoured of them; but when some such muttering was brought to the face of the Assembly; all did deny they knew any author of such a speech: so, no man avowing it, the Scots let such a calumny [!] pass, without any apology. I believe they wished, and thought it just, that all the Reformed churches should do all which the divines of Walachren have, in the defence of the cause of God and all the Reformed churches, against common and very dangerous adversaries. But I heard them say, in private, that they had no correspondence at all with any foreign churches; it might be, that some of them had sometimes Letters from the minister of the Scots' Staple at Campvere, but that none of them had sent him either the Apologetical Narration, or so much as our answer to it; that they had never motioned any censure of that book by the foreign divines. However, in the good providence of God, that Letter came. It is expected the synod of Zealand will not only avow what their brethren have written, but will give their brotherly advice to this synod, anent [concerning] all the things in hand; which, I assure you, will be very well taken, and do much good: especially if, with their serious dissuasive from Independency and cordial exhortation to erect presbyteries and synods, they join their counsels for abolishing the relics of Romish superstition, in their festival days and liturgy, etc.; and, above all, to beware of any toleration of sects,

^a P. 144.—In 1648 appeared,—printed at London, 16mo. pp. 170, but "*Dabam Ipsuici in Nova Anglia*, Dec. 22, 1645;" with a preface in Latin by "*Johannes Cotton*," and an address to the Reader, also in Latin, dated "*Lond. Feb. 16, 1647-[8]*," signed "*Tho. Goodwin; Phil. Nye; Sidr. Simpson*."—a masterly production under the title of "*Responsio ad totam Quæstionum Syllogen à Clarissimo Viro, Domino Guilielmo Apollonio, Ecclesiæ Middleburgensis Pastore, propositam. Ad componendas Controversias quasdam circa Politiam Ecclesiasticam in Anglia nunc temporis agitatas spectantem. Per Johannem Nortonum, Ministrum Ecclesiæ quæ est Ipsuici in Nova Anglia.—Ezek. xliii. 11.*" This is said to be the first American book written in Latin. Fuller, Church Hist. bk. xi. p. 213, says of it, "Of all the authors I have perused concerning the opinions of those 'Dissenting Brethren,' none to me was more informative than Mr. John Norton, one of no less learning than modesty."

^b See back, p. 258.

^c See back, p. 256.

^d In Austin Friars, London.

wherein you are an evil and dangerous example. If you assist us at this time, God may make us helpful to you another day. Farewell, March 10th, [1643-4]."^a It must be remembered that this very Letter is addressed "To Mr. William Spang," Baillie's cousin, and the minister of the above said "Scots' Staple at Campvere," in Walachria, or Walcheren; the duplicity which was being carried on between them, is a humiliating lesson of human nature; we shall see more of it.

In his next Letter, dated April 2nd, Baillie tells Spang, "I showed in my last,^b how we were brought, in our Assembly, to the chief question, That many particular congregations were under the government of one presbytery. The Independents pressed they might first be heard in the negative. Here they spent to us many of twenty long sessions. Goodwin took most of the speech upon him; yet they divided their arguments among them, and gave the managing of them by turns to Bridge, Burroughes, Nye, Simpson, and Caryl. Truly, if the cause were good, the men have plenty of learning, wit, eloquence, and, above all, boldness and stiffness, to make it out; but when they had wearied themselves, and over-wearied us all, we found the most they had to say against the Presbytery was but curious idle niceties; yea, that all they could bring was noways concluding. Every one of their arguments, when it [each] had been pressed to the full, in one whole session, and sometimes in two or three, were voiced, and found to be light unanimously, by all but themselves. By this means, their credit did much fall in the city, who understood daily all we did, and found these men had got much more than fair play, a more free liberty than any innovators ever in any assembly, to reason their cause to the bottom; but further in the country [where were they] who knew not the manner of our proceedings, their emissaries filled the ears of the people—That the Assembly did cry down the truth with votes, and [that it] was but an anti-christian meeting which would erect a Presbytery worse than Bishops!

"For to remedy these evils and to satisfy the minds of all, we thought meet to essay how far we could draw them in a private friendly way of accommodation; but Satan, the father of discord, had wellnear crushed that motion in the very beginning. After our first meeting with some three of the Assembly, Marshall, Palmer, Vines; and three of them, Goodwin, Burroughes, Bridge, with my lord Wharton, Sir Harry Vane, and the Solicitor, in our house, and very fair appearances of pretty agreement, Mr. Nye was like to spoil all our play. When it came to his turn, in the Assembly, to oppugn the Presbytery, he had from Matt. xviii. drawn, in a crooked unformal way which he never could get in a syllogism, The inconsistence of a Presbytery with a Civil State. In this, he was cried down as impertinent. The day following, when he saw the Assembly full of the prime nobles and chief members of both Houses, he did fall on that argument again, and very boldly offered to demonstrate that our way of drawing a whole kingdom under one national assembly is formidable, yea, thrice over pernicious to civil states and kingdoms. All cried him down, and some would have had him expelled the

^a Letter 44. P. 435.

^b "To Scotland." See back, p. 258.

Assembly as seditious. Mr. Henderson showed, he spoke against the government of ours and all the Reformed churches, as Lucian and the pagans wont to stir up princes and states against the christian religion. We were all highly offended with him. The Assembly voted him to have spoken against the order : this is the highest of their censures. Maitland was absent ; but enraged when he heard of it. We had many consultations what to do : at last, we were resolved to pursue it no further, only we would not meet with him except he acknowledged his fault. The Independents were resolute not to meet without him, and he resolute to recall nothing of the substance of that he had said : at last, we were entreated by our friends, to shuffle it over the best way might be, and go on in our business. God, that brings good out of evil, made that miscarriage of Nye, a mean to do him some good ; for, ever since, we find him in all things the most accommodating man in the company. " This and sundry occurrences have made the sails of that party fall lower. My lord Say's credit and reputation is none at all, which wont to be all in all. Sir Harry Vane, whatever be his judgment, yet less or more does not own them, and gives them no encouragement. No man I know in either of the Houses, of any note, is for them. Sundry officers and soldiers in the army are fallen from their way to antinomianism and anabaptism, which burdens them with envy. Not any one in the Assembly, when they have been heard to the full, in any one thing, is persuaded by them ; but all profess themselves to be more averse from their ways than before. The Brethren of New England incline more to synods and presbyteries ; driven thereto by the manifold late heresies, schisms, and factions, broken out among them ; also the many pens that have fallen, more sharply than we, on their Apologetic Narration.

" These and divers other accidents have cooled somewhat of these men's fervour ; above all, the Letter from Holland has given them a great wound. Our good friend in Zealand gave to his neighbour so good information of all he heard from us here, that so soon as the classes of Walachren did meet to consult about the Letter which this Synod sent to them, as to all the Reformed churches, they were very bent presently to write an answer, in the which they fell flat and expressly upon the Independents and their Apologetic Narration, showing how far their way was contrary to the Word of God, to the Reformed churches, and to all sound reason[!] This was read openly in the face of the Assembly, and in the ears of the Independents, who durst not mute against it. It was appointed to be translated into English, and sent to be read in both Houses of Parliament, which was done accordingly. This has much vexed the minds of these men ; and yet, we expect from the synod of Zealand now sitting, more water to be put in their wine. It seems they are justly crossed by God ; for beside all the error and great evil which is in their Way, they have been the only men who have kept this poor Church in an anarchy so long a time ; who have preferred the advancement of their private new fancies to the Kingdom of Christ ; who have lost many thousand souls through the long confusion occasioned by their wilfulness only ; and the settling of the land, which their Way hitherto has kept loose and open, to the evident hazard of its ruin.

Their ways, private and public, have taken away, from the most of beholders, the opinion which was of their more than ordinary piety and ingenuity: that now is gone. All this contributes to the peace of this Church.

“While we came to prove the affirmative of our tenet anent [concerning] the Presbytery, they jangled many days with us; but at last it was carried, and sundry scriptures were voiced also for that proposition, to our great joy. In the debate, they let fall so much of their mind, that it was hoped they might come up, if not fully to our grounds, yet to most of our practical conclusions. For this end, the Assembly appointed a committee of four of them and four of the Assembly to meet with us four, to see how far we could agree. We were glad that what we were doing in private should be thus authorised. We have met some three or four times already, and have agreed on five or six propositions, hoping, by God’s grace, to agree in more. They yield, that a Presbytery, even as we take it, is an ordinance of God, which hath power and authority from Christ to call the ministers and elders, or any in their bounds, before them; to account for any offence in life or doctrine; to try and examine the cause; to admonish and rebuke, and if they be obstinate, to declare them as ethnics and publicans, and give them over to the punishment of the magistrates; also, doctrinally to declare the mind of God in all questions of religion, with such authority as obliges to receive their just sentences: that they will be members of such fixed Presbyteries; keep the meeting; preach as it comes to their turn, join in the discipline after doctrine. Thus far we have gone on without prejudice to the proceeding of the Assembly.

“When we were going to the rest of the propositions concerning the Presbytery, my Lord Manchester wrote to us from Cambridge what he had done in the University, how he had ejected, for gross scandals, the heads of five colleges: . . . also, because of the multitude of scandalous ministers he behoved to remove, he renewed to the Assembly his former motion anent [concerning] the expediting of Ordination. This has cast us on that head. . . . The last four sessions were spent upon an unexpected debate: good Mr. Calamy and some of our best friends fearing the Separatists’ objections anent [concerning] the Ministry of England, as if they had no calling; for this reason, among others, ‘that they were ordained without the People’s election, yea, without any flock; for the Fellows of their colleges are ordained ministers *sine titulo*, long before they are presented to any people;’ when we came therefore to the proposition, ‘That no man should be ordained a minister without a designation to a certain church,’ they stiffly maintained their own practice: yet we carried it this afternoon. . . .

“Our paper anent [concerning] the Sacraments, we gave in. We agreed, so far as we went, except in a ‘table:’ here all of them oppose us, and we them. They will not, and say the people will never, yield to alter their practice. They are content of [with] sitting, albeit not as of a rite [ritual] institute; but to come out of their pews to a Table, they deny the necessity of it: we affirm it necessary, and will stand to it. The Independents’ way of celebrating seems to be very irreverent. They have the communion every Sabbath, without any preparation be-

fore or thanksgiving after : little examination of the people : their very prayers and doctrine before the Sacrament, use not to be directed to the use of the Sacrament. They have, after the blessing, a short discourse, and two short graces over the elements, which are distributed and participated in silence, without exhortation, reading, or singing ; and all is ended with a psalm, without prayer. Mr. Nye told us his private judgment that, in preaching, he thinks the minister should be covered and the people dis-covered ; but in the Sacrament, the minister should be dis-covered, as a servant, and the guests all covered. . . We expect good from the synod of Zealand : we wish they may consider the giving of Excommunication to every congregation.”^a

In a Letter placed in order next after the above, addressed “ To Mr. David Dickson and Mr. Robert Ramsay only,” Baillie tells them, “ My public Letter^b has the best of the outside of our affairs. This to you, who can bear it, and make your own good use of it, shall have the worst of the inside. . . The public affairs, both of church and state, beside the daily weight of their care, give to us all sundry heavy and perplexed nights, for fear of their miscarriage. . . The great Lord arise and help us, for everywhere the enemy is much stronger than we expected. Their wickedness is in nothing relented ; their sermons and pamphlets breathe nothing but the old ways of error, superstition, episcopacy, absolute monarchy, to which, in no case, resistance by any may be made ; in none of them any appearance of remorse of anything past. . . The ways of the Parliament are endless and confused, full of jealousy and other faults. The unhappy Independents keep all the matters of the church so loose, that there is no appearance of any short settling. The preface of my Sermon has put some edge on the Assembly for a quicker despatch ; but the nature itself of their way is so woefully longsome, that it is almost impossible to be shortened. The number and evil humour of the antinomians and anabaptists do increase. In a word, things here are in a hard condition. . . The matter of our present debates in our Assembly, is the people’s interest in their minister to be ordained. We hope to give light to these scabrous questions . . . After the writing hereof, this Sunday, March 24th, we are all afflicted with sad news from Newark. . . I hope to-day, or to-morrow, we shall present,—as on Monday it was appointed,—in the Assembly, our model of a presbyterial ordination presently to be put in practice. After a thick darkness God will send light.”^c

The Letter, No. 48, has this remark in it, “ We have great wrestling with the Independents, yet we hope all shall conclude well, for daily we gain ground.”^d

No. 49, dated April 12th, is addressed to Spang, and begins thus ; “ Being informed that sundry of your post-letters were broken up by the way, I wrote to you under another name ; but finding that all mine are come safe to your hand, I need not, I think, use any more that disguise. . . All our company think themselves obliged to you. . . The unhappy and unamendable prolixity of this people in all their affairs, except God work extraordinarily, is like to undo them. They can put

^a Letter 45. P. 436—440 ; 447.

^b No. 43.

^c Let. 46. P. 447—450.

^d P. 454.

nothing to any point, either of church or state. We are vexed and overwearied with their ways. . . I cannot tell you what to say of the Assembly. We are almost desperate to see anything concluded for a long time. Their way is wofully tedious. Nothing, in any assembly that ever was in the world, except Trent, like to them in prolixity. Particulars you shall have with the next. This day was read the answers of the divines of Hesse-Cassel. We were very dissatisfied with their Letter: it was but a poor short epistle, all spent upon lamenting their own miseries, and, in the little they spoke to our point, giving us unseasonable and very unsavoury counsel not to meddle with the Bishops. We marvelled the less at this, reading the subscription only of cathedral-men; a superintendent, some archdeacons and deacons of a cathedral. You know Mr. Peters better than to marvel at anything he writes; all here take him for a very imprudent and temerarious man. I fear upon some of his passages this day, that his malapert rashness prove very dangerous to this church and state. For to understand the fruits of Independency, read this pamphlet. . . You know I wrote to you the great harm of that clause of your Walachren Letter, of the entire power of government in the hands of congregational presbyteries, except in cases of alteration and difficulty, etc. Not only the Independents make use of it publicly against us, but some of *our* prime men, Mr. Marshall by name, upon it, and Voetius, who from Parker has the same, dissents from us; giving excommunication, and, which is more, ordination, to our sessions in all ordinary cases. If you can get this helped in the Zealand Letter, it shall be well; for one of *our* divines, in face of the Assembly,—Seaman by name,—has been forced to decline with all reverence your authority, saying that Voetius was but one man, and the classes of Walachren but one class; that the acts of your general assembly, and Harmony of Confessions, give the power of excommunication and ordination in ordinary cases to your classes, and not to your parochial consistories.”^a

Seven days after the above, Baillie wrote again to his “Reverend and Dear Cousin:” here he communicates, “That any of the Assembly have written for Mr. Durie [Dury] is more than I know. . . His Letter to the Synod I heard read with no great regard; for it savoured of somewhat. If he be pleased to come over to Oxford, he may resolve to be taken while he lives by us all here for a malignant; and if he should come to us with the least tincture of episcopacy, or liturgic learning [leaning?], he would not be welcome to any I know. As you love the man, persuade him to stay at this time where he is.”^b . . Our Assembly at last has perfected Ordination, both in the doctrinal and directory parts. . . The Independents are resolved yet to give in their reasons against us, and that will be the beginning of an open schism. Likely, after that, we will be forced to deal with them as open enemies. They have been here most unhappy instruments, the principal, if not the sole, causes why the parliament were so long in calling an Assembly; and when it was called, why nothing in a whole year could be gotten concluded. In the mean time they, over all the land, are making up a faction to

^a P. 454—456.

^b See back, p. 387, note.

their own way ; for the most part whereof is fallen off to Anabaptism and Antinomianism : sundry also worse, if worse needs be ; the mortality of the soul, the guide of angels and devils ; and cast off all sacraments ; and many blasphemous things. All these are from New England, where divers are in irons for their blasphemies, condemned to perpetual slavery, and well near by a few votes it went for the life. They proclaim their fears of the rigours of Presbytery. Possibly they are conscious of their unsufferable tenets, and certainly they know their own rigour against the Presbyterians. In all New England, no liberty of living for a Presbyterian. Whoever there, were they angels for life and doctrine, will essay to set up a different way from them, shall be sure of present banishment."^a

Six days later, Spang is thus addressed, " We are all very sensible of your prudent diligence ; by all means go on with your divines for their answer. I wish these whom you have engaged in Zealand were put on to engage with themselves the divines of the other provinces, especially the Presbytery of Leyden, also Rivet and Voetius. There is great need, for this is a very . . . fickle people. Write what they please against bishops and ceremonies *obiter*, for our confirmation ; for these are now out of the hearts of all here almost : but above all, and in earnest, let them exhort to be watchful against anarchical schisms, and the heresies of Antinomians and Anabaptists. These three come together cordially against all the Reformed Churches, and increase so much in number and boldness, as easily they would carry all here to a lamentable confusion, if the fear of our armies did not keep them in order ; and as it is, many fear they shall do much, if God prevent it not. We have given in to the Parliament our conclusions anent [concerning] Ordinations ; whereupon, I think we have spent above forty long sessions. To prevent a present rupture with the Independents, we were content not to give in our propositions of Presbyteries and Congregations, that we might not necessitate them to give in their remonstrance against our conclusions, which they are peremptor [ily] to do when we come on that matter. We judged it also convenient to delay till we had gone through the whole matters of the Presbyteries and Synods ; to send them up rather in their full strength than by pieces : also we suffered ourselves to be persuaded to eschew that rupture at this time, when it were advantageous for their bruckle [brittle] state. The Independents having so managed their affairs, that of the officers and soldiers in Manchester's army, certainly also with the General's [Essex], and, as I hear, in Waller's likewise, more than the two parts are for them, and these of the far most resolute and confident men for the Parliament-party. Judge ye if we had not need of our friends' help.

" I wish we had Letters by some of your friends' means from Switzerland and Geneva ; and however the French divines dare not keep public correspondence, and I hear the chief of them are like some of yours, so much courtiers, that they will not help us in the half they dare and might, policy and prudence so far keep down their charity and zeal ; yet I think some of the ministers of Paris, and their professors, if they were dealt with by some of your friends, might, in

^a Let. 50. Vol. ii. p. 1, 3, 4

private Letters, either to some here, or some with you, write so much of their mind in this public cause of church-government, as might contribute to the encouragement of this fainting and weak-hearted people. In any Letters that come here, I wish they may be sparing of the point of the Magistrate; also in the enlarging of the power of particular congregations."^a

To Mr. David Dickson he writes, April 29th, "In this long anarchy, the sectaries and heretics increase marvellously; yet we are hopeful, if God might help us, to have our presbyteries erected, as we expect shortly to have them, and get the chief of the Independents to join with us in our practical conclusions, as we are labouring much for it, and are not yet out of hope, we trust, to win about all the rest of these wild and enormous [erroneous] people. However, for the time, the confusions about religion are very great and remediless."^b

May 3rd, in another Letter to Spang, his "cousin" tells him, "For that Letter of your Synod, a better turn could not have been done to us. It was read with very good acceptance, and a committee is appointed not only to translate and transmit it to the Houses, as the former,^c but to think of an answer; which, according to their woeful way, cannot be expected for some months. Doubtless the point of the Magistrate will hinder the printing of it here, but we wish it were printed there, and sent over; with the former Walachren's. No man here can get the copy of either. . . What I wrote, of engaging your other provinces, professors, and other churches, you will do what you may herein. . .^d When we have any truce with the Independents anent [concerning] our Presbytery, we fall in new wars with others. For our sessions [in the Assembly], a great party in the Synod, for fear of ruling-elders, and in opposition to Independency, will have no ecclesiastic court at all, but one presbytery for all the congregations within its bounds. I cannot tell you our daily perplexities."^e

On the 9th, Baillie tells Mr. Robert Ramsay, "For our Assembly-matters, we are daily perplexed; not only we make no progress, and are far from the sight of any appearance of an end, but also matters oft in hazard of miscarriage. The Independents, so far as we can see, are peremptory for a schism; and their party is very strong and growing, especially in the army. The leading men in the Assembly are much at this time divided about the questions in hand, of the power of congregations and synods. Some of them would give nothing to Congregations, denying peremptorily all example, precept, or reason, for a Congregational Eldership; others, and many more, are wilful to give to Congregational Eldership all and entire power of ordination, excommunication, and all. Had not God sent Mr. Henderson, Mr. Rutherford, and Mr. Gillespie among them, I see not that ever they could agree on any settled government."^f

After this, comes what is headed "Memorandum to Mr. Buchanan;" whence is discerned more of the tactics by which the Assembly and the Parliament were attempted to be deluded. "I conceive it very

^a Let. 51. Apr. 25. p. 4, 5.

^b Let. 52. p. 7.

^c See back, p. 427.

^d Here Boillie notices "a wicked piece, which one of the Independents wrote against D. Stuart [Dr. A. Steuart], at 6d."

^e Let. 54. p. 9, 10.

^f Let. 55. p. 11.

expedient that you write to some of the ministers of Paris, Geneva, and Bern, the true estate of our affairs, how that a mighty faction is arisen to prefer liberty of conscience for all sects, at least a freedom for Morellius's popular government of the church; that the Scots and most of the Synod and Parliament are for the establishing the government by synods and classes. It would encourage them much if the divines of Geneva and Switzerland would, in their answers to the Synod's Letter, as the divines of Zealand have done in their Letter, and the divines of Hesse also, exhort the Synod at some length, and in earnest, to beware of that pernicious liberty of all sects, in particular those who are enemies to the discipline of all the Reformed. There is a golden occasion in hand, if improved, to get England conformed, in worship and government, to the rest of the Reformed. If nothing dare be written in public, by the French, see if they will write their mind, for our encouragement, to any private friend, here or in Holland. You would [should] write for the same purpose to Moulin in Sedan, and Spanheim in Leyden. It were good, if they write, that their Letters were conceived in the greatest names they could procure: the [Faculty of] Theology of Bern would [should] get a Letter from the Switzerland church; those of Geneva from their whole ecclesiastic classes; Moulin from the University of Sedan, and Spanheim from the University of Leyden. It were not ill that in all their Letters, they congratulated the abolition of Episcopacy and Popish ceremonies, and exhorted to set up quickly the Government of Christ [!]^a—that so long an anarchy as has been here, is the mother of heresies and schisms;—and many more evils."^a

^a Let. 56, not dated, p. 13. The truckling subserviency of one of the Foreign Divines, Monsieur de Moulin, Professor of Divinity in the University of Sedan, in France; is, fortunately for the evil-entreated, appended to Vicar's "Schismatic Sifted, 1646," p. 40; but to whom it is addressed is not recorded. Spang should seem to be the honoured individual who is addressed, and it is clear that Baillie was at Rotterdam in April 1645; see Steven's Hist. of the Scottish Church there, p. 15; but whether he had had a personal interview with Moulin is not mentioned. "Sir,—A certain friend of mine, an honest religious man, hath given me notice that certain persons do find fault with the Order and Discipline established in our Church; in which, the consistory are subject to the colloquies, and the colloquies to the provincial synod, and the provincial to the national synod. And their desire is to have every particular consistory, or congregation, of one and the same absolute authority, independent from any superior authority. . . Upon which, my said friend earnestly desired to have my opinion or judgment on the matter; which, being of such a nature and importance, I could not any way decline or deny his request, which I have here set down, and is as followeth: I say, that those which propound this opinion ought in no manner or wise to be hearkened unto; for if in case this their opinion were followed, there could nothing else ensue but the certain ruin of the Church, and an extreme confusion." Ten "reasons" to support this judgment are then added, as, that, 1. two ministers of one parish or congregation fall into factions; there must needs be help of a superior authority: 2. a minister leads an ungodly life; who shall depose him? 3. if any one of the congregation be unjustly suspended from the holy communion, unto whom shall he direct himself to be readmitted? 4. if heresies happen in any church, what remedy is there but by a synod? 5. if appeals be taken away from synods, they need no more to meet, for they have nothing to do: 6. "there are many small parishes in the country where the consistory is composed of one minister—of none of the greatest capacity,—and of four or five countrymen or clowns who are elders of that church: and shall to such a church be given such an absolute independent

The next letter is to Spang, without a date, but should be May 10th:—

“The letter of your classes of Zealand, I fear it shall here be drained, as well as that of Walachren; because the Independents, on the occasion of the clause of the Magistrate, work by their too many friends, on the Parliament to suppress it. You would do well to cause print it there, and send over a number of copies. . . Little D. Homes [is] the author of the ‘Cool Conference;’^a ‘M. S. against A. S. is John Goodwin of Coleman-street.’^b He names you expressly, and professes to censure the Letter of Zealand. He is a bitter enemy to Presbytery, and is openly for a full liberty of conscience to all sects, even Turks, Jews, Papists, and all to be more openly tolerate than with you. This way is very pleasant to many here. We are much obliged to that excellent divine Apollonius.^c We trust he will, with all diligence, go on in his avowed intention: there is nothing wherein he can do better service to God and the Reformed Churches. To understand them better, I send you herewith other two pieces. That faction increases mightily in number, hopes, and pride. But if it please God to give us good news from York, we will tell them more of our mind [!] Our opinion of their piety and ingenuity is much diminished by that we see and hear daily from the best of them. It is marvelled that the rest of your provinces and professors will not follow the gracious and charitable example of Zealand. Shall they see both the church and state of all these three kingdoms perish, and stand aloof without the least assistance by the stretch of their pen, when they are called to it by our lamentable Letters, and the gracious example of their compassionate brethren? . . . Mr. Forbes, in Delft,^d has sent us over in writ,

authority? And if their minister happen to die, will you believe those clowns, sitting to judge of the capacity of a new minister, to give him the imposition of hands, or to order in this case whatever may be needful?” 7. if it be necessary to keep a fast through all the churches in the kingdom, who shall ordain this fast? 8. if it be necessary to remonstrate to the king’s majesty, who shall depute the party that shall present the petition of the churches of the whole kingdom? 9. if it be found needful to alter anything in the discipline of the church in general, can this be done by particular consistories being independent and not subject to any general ordinance? 10. neither of two contending churches can be judge in their own cause; of necessity there must be relief by a superior authority. These “reasons” having been stated, Moulin continues by saying, “I will not believe, though I confess there is cause of jealousy, that those that desire this Independency have any intelligence with the enemy; and that thereby they seek, under pretence of Reformation, to bring us into a confusion, or at least to expose us to the laughter of our enemies: though, I say, I fear this, by many symptoms thereof, I rather will, in charity, believe they err through want of experience and knowledge of what is profitable for the Church of God. The end of every good Christian and commonwealth’s-man is to glorify God in maintaining his true religion, to serve the king in the preservation of his royal person and dignity, and to procure the common good in maintaining justice, and liberty of the subject and kingdom. All these, though three branches, arise and spring from one root, and have the same essence and being: but it is impossible that any man should truly affect the king or commonwealth, that is slight and negligent in religion; nor can any man fully discharge his duty to God, that is not careful of king and commonwealth.”

^a See back, p. 251. note b.

^b See back, p. 341.

^c Read here, and elsewhere, Apollonij, sounded Apollonii.

^d Patrick Forbes, M.A., see Steven’s Hist., p. 297.

a very pretty piece against the Apologetic. . . On Friday, after a week's debate, we carried, albeit *hardly*, That no single Congregation had the power of Ordination. To-morrow we begin to debate if they have any right of Excommunication. We gave in, long ago, a paper to the great committee, wherein we asserted a congregational eldership, for governing the private affairs of the congregation, from the 18th of Matthew. Mr. David Calderwood, in his Letter to us, has censured us grievously for so doing; showing us that our books of discipline admit of no presbytery or eldership but one; that we put ourselves in hazard to be forced to give Excommunication, and so entire government, to congregations, which is a great step to Independency. Mr. Henderson acknowledges this; and we are in a peck of troubles with it."^a

In a "Postscript to Mr. Spang's Letter, May 17th," Baillie writes,—"While I had written thus far, your's of the 3rd of May comes to my hand. . . Apollonius's Letter and questions [queries] I had gotten before, by another secret means. I fear these men shall either not write, or delay too long, or write obscurely; for, as I conceive, they are not at a point in their own mind, as yet, what to stand at [!]. Among themselves are sundry differences which time will bring out. They profess to differ from these of England; but who knows wherein? The main seems to be in liberty of conscience; for both seem to avow the divine right of synods for consulting, albeit the destroying of presbyteries-classical: for a presbytery to them is our session, and our presbytery is their synod. Take herewith another of their apologies: it is old, nameless, and, as yet, I have not read it; only they in New England are more strict and rigid than we, or any church, to suppress, by the power of the magistrate, all who are not of their way, to banishment ordinarily, and presently even to death lately, or perpetual slavery: for one Jortin, some-time a famous citizen here for piety, having taught a number in New England to cast off the Word and Sacrament, and deny angels and devils, and teach a gross kind of union with Christ in this life, by force of arms was brought to New Boston, and there, with ten of the chief of his followers, by the civil court was decerned [adjudged] perpetual slaves; but the votes of many were for their execution. They lie in irons, though gentlemen; and out of their prison write to the Admiral here, to deal with the Parliament for their deliverance.

"The Independents here, finding they have not the magistrate so obsequious as in New England, turn their pens, as you will see in M.S., to take from the magistrate all power of taking any coercive order with the vilest heretics. Not only they praise your magistrate—who, for policy, gives some secret tolerance to divers religions, wherein, as I conceive, your divines preach against them as great sinners—but avow that, by God's command, the magistrate is discharged to put the least discourtesy on any man, Jew, Turk, Papist, Socinian, or whatever, for his religion! I wish Apollonius considered this well. The five he writes to will not say this; but M.S. is of as great authority here as any of them. Your course of engaging the

^a Let. 57, p. 14—16.

other Provinces is very good. I send this enclosed to a friend here,^a who is well acquainted in Paris, Bern, Leyden, Sedan, and Geneva, who accordingly has written to all these five places for their assistance in the common cause. My correspondence with you is so secret as may be [!] Some of them suspect somewhat of you; but know little: however, they must be content that all the Reformed whom they openly avow to oppugn, should declare what sense they have of their wounds and danger from them. I long for Morellius and Sadael;^b also if by Mr. Paget, or any of your friends at Amsterdam, you could find any of the writs [writings] of Browne, the first sectary, for however I have used all possible diligence yet cannot I find any of that man's writs here: they would, I conceive, be very useful to me.

"This day was the best that I have seen since I came to England. General Essex, when he went out, sent to the Assembly, to entreat that a day of fasting might be kept for him. We appoint, this day, four of our number to preach and pray at Christ's church; also, taking the occasion, we thought it meet to be humbled in the Assembly, so we spent from nine to five very graciously. After Dr. Twisse had begun with a brief prayer, Mr. Marshall prayed large two hours, most divinely, confessing the sins of the members of the Assembly in a wonderful, pathetic, and prudent way: after, Mr. Arrowsmith preached an hour, then a psalm; thereafter, Mr. Vines prayed near two hours, and Mr. Palmer preached an hour, and Mr. Seaman prayed near two hours, then a psalm; after, Mr. Henderson brought them to a sweet conference of the heat confessed in the Assembly, and other seen faults, to be remedied, and the conveniency to preach against all sects, especially Anabaptists and Antinomians. Dr. Twisse closed with a short prayer and blessing. God was so evidently in all this exercise, that we expect certainly a blessing both in our matter of the Assembly and whole kingdom. . . Our affairs here, blessed be God, are in an excellent posture everywhere, when we settle, your estates [of the United Provinces] cannot hope to get any thanks. We might have perished, and they looked on us without any help. God will not be mocked."^c It will be observed that no Independent took part in the longsome service of this day; and it would appear, from Henderson's part, that they must have been altogether absent. Notwithstanding the "excellent posture" of the "affairs" of the Presbyterians on the 17th of May, on the 19th Baillie tells his reverend and dear brother, Mr. Robert Blair, "We are advertized that much more than the most part of my Lord Manchester's army are seduced to Independency [!] and very many of them have added either anabaptism or antinomianism, or both. . . We all conceive that our silly simple lads are in great danger to be infected by their company; and if that pest enter our army, we fear it may spread."^d

On the 31st he writes to Spang, "As for the Synod's acceptance of your Zealand Letter, I assure you, after it was read, Mr. Calandrin was called in, and it was solemnly declared to him, by the Prolocutor, how thankfully the Assembly took it, and how much they were obliged

^a In Let. 56, to Buchanan: see back, p. 434.

^b Their books.

^c Let. 59, p. 17—19.

^d Let. 60, p. 19.

for it. As for returning an answer, they have no power to write one line to any soul, but as the Parliament directs; neither may they importune the Parliament for warrants to keep foreign correspondence[!] With what art and diligence that general one [warrant] to all the churches was gotten, I know. You know this is no proper Assembly, but a meeting called by the Parliament to advise them in what things they are asked; so their not answering comes on no neglect, I know very well. By all means encourage Apollonius, and whomsoever else you can, to assist in this common cause. If this season be missed, it will be hardly recovered. The Independents have no considerable power, either in the Assembly or Parliament, or the General [Essex's] or Waller's army; but in the city and country, and Manchester's army, their strength is great and growing; yet, by the help of God and our friends, if once we had the Assembly at our end, and peace, we would get them quieted [!]

"Since our Friday fast, we have made good speed in the Assembly. Our church-sessions, to which Independents gave all, and their opposites nothing at all, we have got settled with unanimity in the Scots' fashion. Our great debate of the power of Excommunication, we have laid aside, and taken in at last the Directory. Already we have past the draught of all the prayers, reading of Scripture, and singing of psalms, on the Sabbath-day, *nemine contradicente*... Always I can say little, till once we pass the Directory, of the Lord's Supper. In the committee we found they were very stickling; the Independents, and all, love so well sundry of their English guises [ceremonies] which we must have away... Manchester has above twelve thousand very well-appointed men... Will neither Rivet nor Voetius follow the example of brave Apollonius? Do your best in this. If men will forsake themselves and us, we will be the more obliged to God."^a

June 7th, is the date of a "Public Letter," in which we read, "Our progress in the Assembly, albeit slow, yet, blessed be God, is sensible daily... Our toil is exceeding great; every day from eight in the morning till near one, and oft in the afternoon from three to half-past six, we are in exercise; only the Saturday free, and that for our Sunday's preaching, when, single times, any of us does vaik [be vacant]... Of a truth, to our power we put spurs to their slow sides. We hope all, ere it be long, shall go according to our heart's desire. The Independents, our great retarders, it is like, shall not vaunt themselves in the end of their oppositions. The most of their party are fallen off to anabaptism, antinomianism, and socinianism; the rest are divided among themselves. One, Mr. Williams, has drawn a great number after him to a singular independency, denying any true church in the world; and will have every man to serve God by himself alone, without any church at all. This man has made a great and bitter schism lately among the Independents.^b We hope, if once we had peace, by God's help, with the spirit of meekness mixed with a little justice [!] to get the most of these erroneous spirits reduced. The ministers of London, near sixscore, have their weekly meetings: they are all Presbyterians, except Burton, said to be a Brownist, John

^a Let. 61. p. 20—22.

^b See on, p. 444.

Goodwin, to be a Socinian[!] and one scrupling pædobaptism. Some of the Independents are lecturers, but none settled ministers... No man here to speak a word either for bishops or liturgy, or any ceremony. We are thinking of a new work over sea, if this church were settled."^a

To Spang, June 9th, he says, "I have got Browne^b at last. Forbes is on [in] the press. Hold Apollonius on. The Independents have set up a number of private congregations in the city. They are exceeding busy. We will have much to do with them. Edwards's piece [Antapologia] we expect the next week at furthest. Strange that your divines of Holland will learn nothing from England: do they sit still while we are a-dying! The calamity may shortly come over to them,"^c

Then comes "My Public Letter," not dated; here the Scots are told, "This day before noon we got sundry propositions of our Directory for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper passed; but in the afternoon we could not move one inch. The unhappy Independents would mangle that sacrament. No catechising nor preparation before, no thanksgiving after, no sacramental doctrine, or chapters in the day of celebration, no coming up to any table, but a carrying of the elements to all in their seats athwart the church; yet all this, with God's help, we have carried over their bellies to our practice. But exhortations at tables yet we stick at. They would have no words spoken at all. Nye would be at covering the head at the receiving. We must dispute every inch of our ground."^d

Following, in order, is a letter headed "For Mr. Robert Ramsay. The end of June." "We see," says Baillie, "very little zeal or mind in the Parliament for the House of God. We are, on occasion, telling them that this neglect is a great cause of the continuance of the war; but for no purpose. The most of the people who are counted religious are running to ways of error and schism of many divers kinds... Very many of the Assembly are departed for want of means. The allowance granted by the Parliament is not paid. What we gave in concerning Ordination, yet lies still; and, by the underhanded dealing of the Independents, is like to come out from the House so mangled, that, if we get it not helped, it will much offend us both for the matter and the preparative, it being the first paper [which] came from us to the House. Very many things that come to be handled in the Assembly are new to us all, and obscure. We have to do with very many scrupulous and thraward [backward] wits."^e

Again to Spang he writes, "Cousin,—Your last, June 1st, and your former, wherein was a part of Rivet's letters, I received the other week... What Mr. Buchanan, at my desire, wrote to Paris, produced a letter from Mons. Drelincourt, with the advice of the whole consistory there, which had been printed, had I not stayed it by this paper: we have sent it to have it rectified according to my motion. What Moulin wrote from Sedan is more to the purpose and our mind,^f though we expected least from that man. Spanheim, I see by his answer, is not disposed to write at this time, except the University would lay it upon him. Certainly, Mr. Rivet is very ill-informed.

^a Let. 62. p. 24.

^b See back p. 438.

^c Let. 63. p. 26.

^d Let. 64. p. 27.

^e Let. 65. p. 28.

^f See back, p. 435.

As I am an honest man, I never heard man, privately or publicly, speak either of his person or any of his writs, but with honour; if he, or any there, will give ear to all that is written from London at this time, they will wrong themselves. That of burning his or any divine's book over sea, is a malignant calumny. We cannot but regret that both your statesmen and divines should see and hear us sweating to the blood under these burdens, which concern all the Reformed alike, while they will obstinately sit still as neutral. . . Apollonius would do well to go on in his writing. . . For the over-swaying power of the Independents you speak of, I know it to be a false fable; only this is true, that they and other sects, joined with the strange backwardness of the most of these here, to do, in time, what they must, and are willing also oft to do, may be very dangerous; and calls for all the help that can be obtained from our neighbours. We are vexed to the heart very often with these unkent [unknown] and unexpected ways of some or other here. . . Not long ago, while I am visiting my good friend Mr. Rous, I find the savour from him of that which then I suspected, and now have found, a dangerous design. After very great labour, we gave in, as our first fruits, a paper for Ordination to both Houses. Oft had they called for it before it came. When it had lien in their hands neglected for many weeks, at last it was committed to a few of the Commons to make a report to the House about it. We hear surmises, that this committee had altered much of our paper; but I finding by Mr. Rous, the chief of that committee, that the alterations were both more and greater than we suspected, and that the committee had closed their report, and were ready to make it to the House, without any further meeting; I persuaded him it would be convenient, before the report was made, . . to confer privately with some of us anent [concerning] these alterations. Upon this he obtained an order of the House for the committee to call for any of the Assembly they pleased. . . At meeting we found they had passed by all the whole doctrinal part of Ordination, and all our scriptural grounds for it; that they had chosen only the extraordinary way of ordination; and, in that very part, had scraped out whatever might displease the Independents, or patrons, or Selden and others, who will have no discipline at all in any church, *jure divino*, but settled only upon the free-will and pleasure of the Parliament. Mr. Henderson and the rest reasoned against the dangerousness and disgrace of this their way, so clearly, that sundry of the gentlemen repented of their alterations; yet the most took all to advisement. We, in private, resolved we would by all means stick to our paper; else, this being the first, if we yielded to these most prejudicial alterations which the Independents and civilians underhand had wrought, the Assembly's reputation was clean overthrown, and Erastus's way would triumph. What will be the end of this debate, God knows. . .

"This day, we were vexed also in the Assembly. We thought we had passed, with consent, Sitting at the Table; but, behold! Mr. Nye, Mr. Goodwin, and Bridge, cast all in the hows [difficulties]; denying to us the necessity of any table, but pressing the communicating of all in their seats, without coming up to a table. Messrs. Henderson, Rutherford, and Gillespie, all three disputed exceeding

well for it with arguments unanswerable ; yet not one of the English did join with us, only Mr. Assessor Burgess, who then was in the chair, beginning to speak somewhat for us, but a little too vehemently, was so met with by the Independents, that a shameful and long clamour ended their debate. This has grieved us, that we fear the end of our work ; always [nevertheless] we expect it shall be better.”^a

In another letter, to the same, July 5th, it is stated, “As for the Assembly, these three weeks, Mr. Nye, and his good friend Mr. Herle, has [have] kept us on one point of our Directory alone, the recommending of the communicants coming up to the table to communicate. . . The classes of Amsterdam have written kind letters to our assembly, and recommended conformity with Scotland [!] Hold on, Apollonius. I wish Voetius engaged.”^b

Also to the same, July 12th, “I wish again and again that Apollonius and Voetius were moved to write. They must not expect that this Assembly, or any member of it, will desire them to do so : it is far above their power ; and if they essayed it, they would soon be taken up by the Parliament. Yet we are doing what we can to get leave to answer, with great respect, all your letters, both of Walachren, Zealand, and Amsterdam. . . Concerning Thomas Cunningham, I wish, by all means, you and he would keep entire correspondence ; otherwise, I foresee it cannot fail to fall out to both your great displeasures. He is taken here, and at home, for a very honest man, and one who is diligent . . . for the common cause. You will not believe what scarcity there is of men whom we dare trust with such a matter. . . It is my earnest advice to you to keep fast with that man. . .^c In our Assembly we go on as we may. The Independents, and others, kept us long three weeks upon one point alone, the communicating at a table. By this we came to debate the divers coming up of companies successively to a table ; the consecrating of the bread and wine severally ; the giving of the bread to all the congregation, and then the wine to all, and so twice coming up to the table ; . . the mutual distribution, the table exhortations, and a world of such questions, which, to the most of them, were new and strange things. After we were over-toiled with debate, we were forced to leave all these things, and take us to general expressions, which, by a benign exposition, would infer our church-practices, which the most promised to follow, so much the more as we did not necessitate them by the Assembly’s express determination. We have ended the matter of the Lord’s supper, and these last three days have been upon the subject of baptism. We have carried, with much greater ease than we expected, the publicness of baptism. The abuse was great over all this land ; in the greatest parish of London, scarce one child in a year was brought to the church for baptism. Also we have carried the parent’s presenting of his child, and not the midwives, as was their universal custom. In our last debate with the committee of Commons, for our paper of Ordination, we were in the midst, over head and ears, of that greatest of our questions, The power of the Parliament in

^a Let. 66, P. 29—31.

^b Let. 67, P. 33, 34.

^c His name occurs in a register, Nov. 12th, 1645, cited in Steven’s History of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam, p. 16 ; where he styles himself “Conservator.”

our ecclesiastic affairs. It is like this question shall be hotter here than anywhere else : but we mind to hold off, for yet it is very unseasonable. As yet we are come to no issue what to do with that paper. . . If Apollonius, or any other, write at all, it were good it were done quickly ; for the chief use, either of their authority or arguments, will be shortly at that nick of time, when the Independents give up their reasons against us to the Parliament. The chief point we wish were proven is—The real authority, power, and jurisdiction of Synods and Classical Presbyteries over any the members, or the whole of a particular congregation : also, The right of ordinary professors to the sacraments, though they can give no certain or satisfactory signs of real regeneration. These two are the main heads ; also I wish the power of Presbyteries-classical to ordain and excommunicate, were cleared. Many, besides the Independents, by Voetius's writs, are brought to give the rights of both these actions to the Congregational Presbytery, much against our mind and practice. The churches of Jerusalem, Corinth, and the rest of the apostolic churches mentioned in the New Testament, which can be proven to have practised either ordination or excommunication, appear to us to have been classical, consisting of more congregations than one, and of greater numbers, when they did exercise either of these acts, than could meet in one place. Also it is a great question, about the power of jurisdiction in a congregation. We are not against the people's power of election of their officers, or at least free consent thereto ; but, besides, they^a press all process and acts of censures to be done, if not in the name and authority, as the Brownists and those of New England, yet, necessarily in the presence, and with the consent, not only of the Presbytery-Congregational, but also of the whole people, even every communicant-male. If in these we were agreed, I think the difficulty would be small in any other matter.”^b

To the Rev. Robert Blair, July 16th. “Blessed be God for evermore, that has looked down upon us all in that glorious 2nd of July.^c We were both grieved and angry that your Independents there should have sent up Major Harrison to trumpet, over all the city, their own praises ; to our prejudice, making all believe that Cromwell alone, with his unspeakably valorous regiments, had done all that service ; that the most of us fled ; and who staid, fought so and so, as it might be. We were much vexed with these reports. . . till Lindsay's letters came at last, and Captain Stewart, with his colours. Then we sent abroad our printed relations, and could lift up our face. But, within three days, Mr. Ash's relation was also printed, who gives us many good words, but gives much more to Cromwell than we are informed is his due. Let good Mr. Ash know what is the use that generally here is made of his relations ; much, I know, beside his intention ; even this, in plain terms, the Independents have done so brave service ; yea, they are so strong and considerable a party, that they must not only be tolerated, but in nothing grieved, and no ways to be provoked. It seems very necessary, that since none of you of purpose and ordi-

^a Namely, “many besides the Independents.”

^b Let. 68, p. 34—38.

^c “Prince Rupert's routing” at Marston-moor.

narily send up relations, and Mr. Ash sends to the press constant intelligence of your actions, which for the man's known integrity are every word believed, your proceedings have a great influence here, both of church and state; I say, it seems needful, that all Mr. Ash's letters which are sent hither to the press, should be first seen, and pondered by some of you there [!] These are my own private motions, which I propone [propound] to you alone, to be made use of as you think fit."^a

July 23rd, he writes to the Rev. David Dickson, "You have, in my Public Letter and papers, the outside of our affairs; but the inside of the thoughts of many here is this: our difficulties, in all our affairs, both of church and state, are great and many, as they have ever been from the beginning till this day; yet the Lord has carried us through hitherto. If His good hand continued not with us, we see no possibility of any tolerable issue. Our progress in the Assembly is small; there is so much matter yet before us, as we cannot win through for a long time after our common pace. Our Independents continue and increase in their obstinacy. Much is added to their pride and hope by their service at the battle of York;^b albeit, much of their valour is grounded on very false lies, prejudicial to God the Author, and to us the true instruments of that day's honour. The politic part [party] in the Parliament is the stronger, who are resolute to conclude nothing in the matters of religion that may grieve the Sectaries, whom they count necessary for the time. Our army is much diminished in number and reputation. . . This is an irresolute, divided, and dangerously-humoured people. We long much to see them settled, and our nation honestly rid of them. . . The Sectaries of divers sorts, Anabaptists chiefly, increase here. Very many are for a total liberty of all religions, and write very plausible treatises for that end. Sundry of the Independents are stepped out of the church, and follow my good acquaintance, Mr. Roger Williams, who says there is no church, no sacraments, no pastors, no church-officers or ordinance in the world, nor has been since a few years after the apostles."^c

"For Glasgow. August 7th," is the superscription of the letter which contains as follows: "At our sitting down this day, a great many of our brethren did complain of the great increase and insolency in divers places of the antinomian and anabaptistical conventicles. A committee was appointed for a remedy of this evil, to be represented quickly to the Parliament. Mr. Edwards has written a splendid confutation of all the Independents' Apology. All the ministers of London, at least more than a hundred of them, have agreed to erect a weekly lecture for him in Christ's Church, in the heart of the city,^d where he may handle these questions and nothing else, before all that will come to hear. We hope God will provide remeids [remedies] for that evil of Independency, the mother and true fountain of the church's distractions here."^e

"August 10th," heads another letter to Spang, here he is informed that, "The first day after our vacance [vacation] a number of com-

^a Let 71, p. 40.

^b On Marston-moor.

^c Let. 73, p. 42, 43; see back, p. 439.

^d Newgate Street.

^e Let. 74 p. 46.

plaints were given in against the anabaptists' and antinomians' large increase, and intolerable insolencies. Notwithstanding of Mr. Nye's and others' opposition, it was carried, that the Assembly should remonstrate it to the Parliament. Both Houses took our complaint well, have sent for the chief of the seditious sectaries, and promise a quick remeid [remedy] to that great and dangerous evil. A kind letter from the Synod of Holland to us was read. We have ended our Directory for baptism. Thomas Goodwin one day was exceedingly confounded. He had undertaken a public lecture against the anabaptists: it was said, under pretence of refuting them, he betrayed our cause to them. That of the Corinthians, our chief ground for baptism of infants, 'Your children are holy,'^a he expounded of a real holiness, and preached down our ordinary and necessary distinction of real and federal holiness! Being posed hereupon, he could no ways clear himself, and no man took his part. God permits these gracious men to be many ways unhappy instruments. As yet, their pride continues; but we are hopeful the Parliament will not own their way so much as to tolerate it, if once they found themselves masters. For the time, they are loth to cast them off, and to put their party into despair, lest they desert them. The men are exceeding active in their own way. They strive to advance Cromwell for their head. They ascribe to him the victory of York; but most unjustly. . . . The sectaries books press most in a universal liberty for all religions. If Apollonius, Voetius, or any other, intend to assist us, let them not delay. Try what answer the Independents have given to Apollonius. In my judgment they neither will nor can declare themselves in the half of his interrogatories."^b

In his "Public Letter, August 18th," Baillie writes, "We have gone through, in the Assembly, the whole Directory for Baptism, except some little things referred to a committee; also the whole Directory for solemn Thanksgiving, with a good unanimity. . . . On Tuesday last, there was a solemn fast for general Essex's army. Mr. Palmer and Mr. Hill preached that day to the Assembly two of the most Scottish and free sermons that ever I heard anywhere. The way here of all preachers, even the best, has been to speak before the Parliament with so profound a reverence, as truly took all edge from their exhortations, and made all applications toothless and adulatorious [adulatory]. That style is much changed of late: however, these two good men laid well about them, and charged public and parliamentary sins strictly on the backs of the guilty; amongst the rest, their neglect to settle religion according to the Covenant, and to set up ordination, which lay so long in their hands. This was a means to make the House of Commons send us down that long-delayed paper of Ordination. On Tuesday, it was twice publicly read, so much altered from our paper, that all of us did much mislike it. To encourage the Assembly to reject it, we did add in the end of our paper an express disavowing of it; and at the committee's desire, we set down our reasons, in writ, against the House's alterations; which did so encourage the Assembly that, this day, unanimously they sent a committee to the House to crave leave to consider their alterations: for without their express order, they have

^a 1 Cor. vii. 14.^b Let. 75, p. 48.

not so much power as to debate a question. This leave is granted: we are confident of reason, seconded by more plain and stout dealing than hitherto has been used, to make them take up their unreasonable alterations of our first paper: also we have the grand committee to meet on Monday, to find out ways of expedience; and we have got it to be the work of the Assembly itself, to do no other thing till they have found out ways of accelerating; so, by God's help, we expect a far quicker progress than hitherto. . . . The King's declaration to foreign members, avows His resolution to stand by the Hierarchy and Liturgy. . . . In our Assembly, we cannot but quickly come to our greatest questions and our hottest debates."^a

In another "Public Letter, August 28th," he writes, "Our Assembly, these days bygone, has been busy on the House of Commons, their alterations of our paper of Ordination; at last they have agreed to send back our desires for changing the most of these alterations, according to the papers which we gave in to the Assembly, and both Houses. Concerning these alterations, we expect, without further ado, the Houses will pass our desires; so that presently all the youths in England, who for many years have waited for a pure ordination, shall be admitted to churches: and when all these, and what more Scotland can afford of good youths for the ministry here, are provided, it is thought some thousands of churches must vaik [be vacant] for want of men. Our next work is to give our advice what to do for suppressing of anabaptists, antinomians, and other sectaries. . . . This will be a hard work [!] yet so much as concerns us, will be quickly despatched, I hope in one session. It is appointed thereafter, that we return to the government, and to hold to it till we conclude the erection of sessions, presbyteries, and synods. The most of the Directory is passed, and the rest is given to proper hands to prepare the models for the Assembly. All the world are sensible of our necessitated delays, and cry for expedition."^b

Now again, to Spang, September 13th, "Church divisions everywhere increase. The sectaries wax bolder daily; yet we are hopeful all shall quickly go better. It is time, I hope, for God to work, our extremity of danger is so great. If Apollonius stand on ceremonies, and wait for the authority of his classis, or stay till he clog his book with other treatises, . . . his purpose will come out of season here, and will be for little purpose. . . . This day, Cromwell has obtained an order of the House of Commons, to refer to the committee of both kingdoms, the accommodation or toleration of the Independents; a high and unexpected order; yet, by God's help, we will make use of it contrary to the design of the procurers. . . . The unkindness of all the Reformed churches to us, at these times, is great: it is England's merit, but may be the great sin of those who have no charity, nor so much zeal as prudence!"^c

^a Let. 77, p. 51—54.

^b Let. 78, p. 54.

^c Let. 79, p. 57.

CHAP. LVII.

GRAND COMMITTEE OF ACCOMMODATION.—BAILLIE.

ON September 13th, 1644, the Committee of Lords and Commons appointed to treat with the Scots commissioners, and the Committee of the Assembly, were ordered by the House of Commons to take into consideration "The differences of the opinions of the members of the Assembly in point of 'Church Government,' and to endeavour a union, if it be possible." And in case "union" be impracticable, they were further ordered to endeavour "The finding out some way how far tender consciences" may be borne with, "according to the Word, and as may stand with the public peace." This "honourable committee," commonly called "The Grand Committee of Accommodation," nominated, September 20th, a sub-committee of six—four Presbyterians, Marshall, Herle, Vines, and Temple; with two Independents, Goodwin and Nye—"To bring in what might be matter for this Grand Committee to consider of." These styled themselves "The Sub-Committee of Agreements," Vines being their chairman. They presented, October 11th, "the propositions they had prepared," but not "perfected," when they were remitted till Tuesday, the 15th; on which day the Grand Committee voted to take the propositions "into consideration," but "that debate was not entered upon, because it was the earnest desire of *some*^a—That the rule should first be made complete, by the Assembly and the Houses:" and the House of Commons put "a cessation herein, until their further pleasure."

In their paper of "Propositions," the sub-committee "do agree as followeth" on points of Government: "1. That a Particular Congregation, having such officers as the Word of God holds out both for preaching and governing, is a church that hath power in all ecclesiastical affairs which do only concern itself." The two next prescribe that so many, "2. Three, or two at the least," of those officers, "may agree" in every act of government; the "two" to be "preaching or governing officers:" but "some of the committee hold" that a "preaching presbyter" should "concur in the sentence of excommunication, and suspension:" 3. these officers have "power" in those things which are voted, "by the Assembly, to be due unto them," together with suspension and excommunication; "some of the committee," the Presbyterians "*meaning* that the major part" of the officers have power to do those acts, "the congregation not opposing;" if otherwise, those members of the committee "hold fit that the officers do suspend the act in question:" "others," the Independents, or Dissenting Brethren, "*saying*," that the major part of the officers have the power "if the major part of the Brethren," or church-mem-

^a Neal says, vol. iii. chap. vi., "The Presbyterians insisted that the new form of government should first pass into a law as a standard, before the exceptions of the Independents be considered."

bers, "so consent unto it, by their votes; so as the negative lies in the major part, either of the officers or brethren." For Ordination, "we all hold" that where there are two preaching presbyters at least, such presbytery may ordain their own elders: but "some," the Independents, do further say, that where there are two "ruling elders" at least, they have power of ordaining elders for that congregation; and, "in case there be no elders—as at the first, *in ecclesia constituenda*—then the choice of elders by the people, with approbation by the neighbouring ministers with fasting and prayer, may suffice."

The fourth proposition affirms that the Elders of the Congregation "shall advise with the Classis," in all cases of excommunication, "before" they proceed to it; and, the Classis hath power to hear and "determine," yet so as that the "power" of the congregation be not concluded thereby, in matter of "excommunication:" but "some," the Independents, say, that in "whatsoever case" they, the elders, find difficulty, they "shall first advise" with some company or classis of neighbour-ministers, as stated beneath the eighth proposition.

For the "associating of churches," let there be [fifthly] a certain number of ministers in each county to "determine the causes and differences in every congregation" within its bounds; and certain "select church-governors assistant unto them:" the first choice, or appointment, to be the Parliament's; and vacancies thenceforward to be supplied by those so constituted. 6. Such among them as are "complained of, or are parties in [the] question," are excepted from debating and voting. 7. Counties to be divided into deaneries, or divisions; and they who may with conveniency more frequently meet, shall have power to hear and determine "within the several congregations of that precinct." 8. National Assemblies of "ministers and others" to be appointed by Parliament.

"To the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th, the whole committee doth assent; only some of them," the Independents, "do desire" that in effect this explanation be inserted," or added, "That the elders and brethren of each congregation, in case they find anything too hard for themselves, or have any controversy among themselves, may have liberty to advise with *any* of those select elders and others in the Province, jointly, or apart, or with the elders of any *other* churches; for the determining and composing the controversy, or resolving of that difficulty: and in case they cannot be satisfied, then to have recourse also to the advice and help of that Classis unto which they appertain."

The ninth proposition prescribes that the members of particular congregations are to reside "within certain bounds and precincts of a parish:" to this the Independents desired may be added, "liberty to dwell in another parish, if the consent of the minister of that other parish be procured;" and that for "villages," the limits be extended to some parish adjoining.

The Presbyterians add, "We having weighed our brethren's principles, do find no probability of accommodation for them ordinarily to enjoy congregations, unless when it shall happen in a parish that the minister cannot administer the sacraments to all in the parish whom, possibly, the neighbour-ministers, or the classis, may judge fit to be

admitted [to enjoy congregations] ; such persons shall have power to procure to themselves the sacraments, either by the help of a neighbour minister, or some other provision be made by a proportionable allowance out of the tithes of the parish, according to the wisdom of the State." And the Brethren, or Independents, subjoin, " Or otherwise, if in a parish it happen that there be a considerable number of such as cannot partake in the ordinances with the minister and people there, they shall have liberty to dispose of themselves as a distinct church, and to choose a minister or ministers at their own charge. . . . If such a liberty shall seem, in the wisdom of this Honourable Committee to be [so] prejudicial to the peace of the Church as not to be permitted, we humbly desire [that] the Doctrinal principles wherein we differ, about church-government, may be taken into serious consideration ; and some other way of Accommodation in Practice thought upon, as shall seem fit to this Honourable Committee."

Concerning " Classis and Synods," the Presbyterians append, " let them pray, expound, resolve difficult cases of conscience, and preach : they may dogmatically declare what the will of Christ is, in such cases as are before them ; and this judgment of theirs ought to be received with reverence and obligation, as from an ordinance of Christ." The Independents, that is, " some of the Brethren, though assenting, yet are bold to add hereunto, That the judgment of any other ; of those elders, in the province or elsewhere, advised with ; they do in like manner look at as the ordinance of Christ, and to have the like obligation in them."

" If," say the Presbyterians, " the doctrine or practice of any particular congregation be erroneous, hurtful, or destructive to holiness, or the peace of that or other congregations ; they are bound to give account thereof to the classis or synod." The Independents added to this, " That the ground of this obligation, to give account ' to the classis or synod,' is *their* being offended, or their churches scandalized thereat." The classis or synod, say the Presbyterians again, " may examine, admonish, and, in case of obstinancy, declare against, that congregation, or any particular member in it ;" the Independents affix this limitation, " That no such examination, admonition, in any classis or assembly, be extended to any particular person in that church ; but unto the church itself, for not putting forth the power that Christ hath given them for reforming him." The classis or synod, it seems to have been mutually assented to, " may judge touching any person who deserves excommunication ; and may charge the several congregational presbyteries, whom it concerns, to do it."

" We conceive," the Presbyterians say further, " that in case the particular eldership refuse to do their duty, the classis may and ought not only to withdraw communion from them, but also, when need is, exercise the sentence of excommunication themselves." Instead of that proposition, the Independents, or " some of the Brethren, do insert this : In case the aforesaid particular churches and elderships offending shall refuse to submit to this course, that then the Classis or Synod are to acquaint their congregations respectively, and so withdraw from them ; denying church-communion and fellowship with them."

The Presbyterians proposed that "In case of Appeal, if it appear to the Classis that the sentence was unjust, they may judge that the particular presbytery ought to reverse it: and in case they obstinately refuse to do it, the Classis may reverse it." The Independents "only say, That they are to proceed as in the former Article."

Lastly: It was set down, that "The Classis or Synod have power to ordain ministers for such congregations as have not a sufficient presbytery in them; and let all congregations associated, first advise with the classis, and take their assistance before they ordain a minister." To this is added, "Some of the Brethren do refer themselves for this, to the last clause in the third proposition delivered in."^a

The above transactions precede a "Public Letter" of Baillie's, dated September 16th: "We have made little progress these fourteen days. We spent a number of sessions on some propositions of advice to the Parliament, for suppressing antinomians, anabaptists, and those who preach a liberty for all religions. Even in these, our good Independents found us great difficulty, and when we had carried our advices against their mind, they offered to give in contrary reasons to the Parliament. We spent two or three days on the matter of a remonstrance to the Parliament, of the sins which provoked God to give us this late stroke; and here we had the most free and strange Parliament that ever I heard [debate] about the evident sins of the Assembly, the sins of the Parliament, . . . of the Army, . . . of the people. When we were in full hope of a large fruit of so honest and faithful a censure, Thomas Goodwin and his brethren, as their custom is to oppose all things that are good, carried it so, that all was dung in the howes [cast into difficulties] and that matter clean laid by. We are again on the Government. We have passed two or three propositions, that the church may be governed by three sorts of assemblies, congregational, classical, and synodical. We begin with synods, and hope to make quicker despatch than before, by God's help. We have sundry means of haste in agitation with our private friends. One of our especial helps must be the prayers of the godly there. This rage of the devil, both here and there, is a good sign to us of a glorious work in hand, which he so violently opposeth."^b

Baillie's next Letter is "For Mr. David Dickson, September 16th."—"How affairs go here you may see in my Public Letters and printed papers: but beside all these you may know more. . . Our greatest fear is, that the forces we have to oppose the king are full of jealousies and malice one against another. The most of the officers in the General [Essex] and Waller's army have open and known quarrels. Manchester's is more pitifully divided. It is like to divide us all incontinent. Manchester himself, a sweet meek man, permitted his Lieutenant-general, Cromwell, to guide all the army at his pleasure. The man is a very wise and active head, universally well beloved as

^a "In case there be no elders,—as at the first, &c.," *ut sup.*—All these Propositions, &c. are gathered from "Papers given in to the Honourable Committee of Lords and Commons and Assembly of Divines with the Commissioners of Scotland, for Accommodation: 1644. By a Sub-Committee of Divines of the Assembly and Dissenting Brethren. Printed, 1648." 4to., pp. 9.

^b Let. 80. p. 58.

religious and stout ; being a known Independent, the most of the soldiers who loved new ways put themselves under his command. Our countryman Crawford was made Major-general of that army : this man, proving very stout and successful, got a great head with Manchester, and with all the army that were not for sects. The other party finding their designs marred by him, set themselves by all means to have him out of the way, that he being removed they might frame the whole army to their devotion, and draw Manchester himself to them by persuasion, or else to weary him out of his charge, that Cromwell might be General. This has been the Independents' great plot by this army, to counterbalance us, and overawe the Assembly and Parliament both to their ends. At this nick of time . . they give in a challenge against Crawford ; they require a committee of war to remove him. . . Manchester, Cromwell, and Crawford, come up themselves. Our labour to reconcile them was vain. Cromwell was peremptory : . . if Crawford were not cashiered, his colonels would lay down their commissions : . . all of us find Crawford . . in nothing considerably guilty, only persecuted to make way to their designs on that army, and by it on the Parliament and kingdom. . . What the end of this may be, God knows. While Cromwell is here, the House of Commons without the least advertisement to any of us or of the Assembly, passes an order that the Grand Committee of both Houses, Assembly, and us, shall consider of the means to unite us and the Independents ; or, if that be found impossible, to see how they may be tolerated. This has much affected us [!] These men have retarded the Assembly these long twelvemonths. This is the fruit of their dis-service, to obtain really an act of Parliament for their Toleration before we have got anything for Presbytery either in Assembly or Parliament. Our greatest friends, Sir Henry Vane and the Solicitor, are the main procurers of all this ; and that without any regard to us who have saved their nation, and brought these two persons to the height of the power now they enjoy, and use to our prejudice [!] . . The great shot of Cromwell and Vane is to have a liberty of all religions without any exception. . . We must make the best of an ill game we can. Marshall mistakes us altogether : he is for a middle way of his own, and draws a faction in the Synod to give ordination and excommunication to Congregations, albeit dependently, in case of mal-administration. God help us ! If God be pleased to settle Scotland, and give us Newcastle, all will go well. We must see for new friends at last, when our old ones without any the least cause have deserted and have half betrayed us. These things to you alone [!]"^a

Then follows a "Public Letter," October.—"We were here for some days under a cloud : . . Sir Henry Vane, our most entire friend, joining with a new faction to procure liberty for all sects, . . did much afflict us for a fortnight. . . Thanks to God, things are in much better posture than lately. . . In the Assembly, thanks to God, we have throughed not only our presbyteries, but also our synods provincial and national, and the subordination of all the four meetings, parochial, classical, provincial, and national. We are now to dispute upon the power of all

^a Let. 81. p. 60—62.

the four. We have strange tugging with the Independents. . . The Confession of Faith is referred to a Committee, to be put in several the best hands that are here. By the help of God, procured by your prayers, our adversaries' designs may contribute to the happy closure of these longsome and wonderfully-troublesome affairs."^a

To Spang, October 25th: "The Independent party lying always at the watch . . . began lustily to play their game. Their first essay was on Manchester's army; there they had cast their strength, under Cromwell. All sectaries who pleased to be soldiers, for a long time casting themselves from all the other, arrive under his command in one body. . . We had another bout with them about Shippon: they made the city crave him to be leader of their new levy of five thousand foot, and to be joined to Manchester. This was by Shippon's foot and Cromwell's horse to have made themselves masters of the field: this we also got crossed. But their greatest plot, wherewith yet we are wrestling, is an order of the House of Commons, contrived by Mr. Solicitor and Mr. Marshall, which they got stolen through.^b . . . This order presently gave us the alarm: we saw it was for a toleration of the Independents by act of Parliament, before the presbytery, or any common rule, were established. Our most trusty friend the Solicitor had throughed it the House before we heard of it. Mr. Marshall had evidently, in the prosecution of it, slighted us. Sir Henry Vane, whom we trusted most, had given us many signs of his alteration; twice at our table prolixly, earnestly, and passionately had reasoned for a full liberty of conscience to all religions without any exceptions; had publicly, in the House, opposed the clause in the ordination [*sic*] that required ministers to subscribe the Covenant, and that which did intimate their being over their flocks in the Lord; had moved the mustering of our army, as being far less than we were paid for; had been offended with the Solicitor for putting in the ordinance the differences about church-government; and not only about free grace, intruding liberty to the antinomians and to all sects, he, without the least occasion on our side, did openly oppose us. Always God has helped us against him and them egregiously to this day. In the first meeting of the grand committee, Mr. Marshall, the chairman, by canny [prudent] convoyance got a sub-committee nominated according to his mind, to draw the differences; Goodwin and Nye, other four, with himself, who joined with the Independents in giving to the Congregations power of excommunication and ordination. Vines, Herle, Reynolds, Temple, Seaman, and Palmer, of our mind, were named, but seeing us excluded by Marshall's cunning, would not join. The next two or three meetings were spent on the sub-committee's draught of the differences. We found the Independents clear for the whole people, every communicant-male, to have decisive voice in all ecclesiastic causes, in admission, deposition, excommunication of ministers, in determining of schisms and heresies: that no congregation did depend on any superior synod: . . . but, which is worst of all, they avow they cannot communicate as members with any congregation in England, though reformed to the uttermost pitch of purity which the Assembly or Parliament are

^a Let. 82. p. 62—63.

^b See back, p. 447.

like to require, because even the English, as all the rest of the Reformed, will consist but of professors of the Truth, in whose life there is no scandal; but they require to a Member, beside a fair profession and want of scandal, such signs of grace as persuade the whole congregation of their true regeneration. We were glad to have them declare this much under their hands; for hitherto it has been their great care to avoid any such declaration; but now they are more bold, apprehending their party to be much more considerable, and our nation [Scotland] much less considerable than before. The change of Providence did nothing daunt our courage; yet we were much in prayer and longing expectation that God would raise us from our lowness, near to contempt, and compeste [defeat] their groundless insolency. At our first meeting, my Lords Say and Wharton, Vane and the Solicitor, pressed vehemently to debate the propositions of the sub-committee. . . Here it was where God helped us beside our expectation. Mr. Rous, Mr. Taite, and Mr. Prideaux, among the ablest of the House of Commons, opposed them to their face. My Lord Chancellor, . . Warriston, . . Maitland, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Gillespie, and all, made their designs to appear so clearly that, at once, many did dislike them; yet Henry Vane went on violently. We refused to consider their propositions except on two express caveats; one, that no report should be made of any conclusion of the [grand] committee till first it came to the Assembly, and from them, after examination, should be transmitted to the House of Commons: another, that first the common rule of government should be resolved, before any forbearance of these who differed therefrom should be resolved upon. The first, after many hours' sharp debate, we obtained: the second, we are to debate to-morrow; and if we obtain it not, we have a brave paper ready, penned by Mr. Henderson, to be given in to the House and Assembly, which will paint out the Independents and their adherents so clearly, that I am hopeful that the bottom of their plots shall be dung [cast] out. . . Apollonius's book will not be delivered to the Assembly till it come off the press. We are extremely obliged to him, and as much disobliged to his opposites. The Letter of the synod of Utrecht was read the other day in the Assembly, but had not one word either of Episcopacy or Independency. We would have expected other things from Voetius; but the Independents' diligence, far and near, is great; yet I believe God will not bless their ways. Rivet, in all our controversies, resolves to be mute and silent also; yet Moulin has written very honestly his mind; but Diodati and the Parisians are not as we expected [!]. The Switzers, and lately the rest of the divines of Geneva, have given us satisfaction. We hope shortly, when God has put our enemies under our feet, these our reverend brethren who have been last in appearing for us, shall be most ample in their encouragements! We are loth to censure any man, only in so great conflicts we would have expected from brethren in a common cause, greater assistance than we have got from any over sea, excepting worthy and noble Apollonius [!]"^a

Under November 1st, Spang is informed that "Our committee at Newcastle wrote up to the Houses to haste the settling of the church.

^a Let. 83. p. 66—68, 70.

This motion was well received by all but Say, Vane, and some few Independents. To comfort them, some six or eight of the chief lords came this day in message from the House of Peers with that Letter, entreated the Assembly to haste: also, in that Letter, the Commons voted, over the Independents' bellies, the dissolving of that dangerous [grand] committee which these five weeks has vexed us. The preface of our Directory, casting out at doors the Liturgy, and all the ceremonies *in cumulo*, is this day passed. It cost us divers days' debate, and these sharp enough, with our best friends. Apollonius's book is not yet off the press, and so I have not seen it; only the preface I read, which I like exceedingly well. One thing I must recommend to your serious care: we are informed from thence very credibly, that the agents of the Independents have so far prevailed over Voetius as to make him publish his approbation of 'The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,'^a as consonant to truth, and the discipline of Holland. If he should be so evil advised as to do anything of this kind at this time, he will wrong himself and us, and all the Reformed churches, exceedingly, and do what in him lies to mar the most great and gracious work here, which, by God's help, after so great opposition, we are carrying to a happy conclusion. You would [should] write to him, and all you can join with you, to obtest him he do not any such work, so unworthy of himself! We could never have suspected any such things, if a very good hand had not confidently assured us of it."^b

The "Public Letter," November 21st, assures those interested, thus: "Our church affairs go on now apace, blessed be God. Our Letters from Newcastle moved the Houses to call once, twice, thrice, to the Assembly for expedition. They sent up our propositions concerning Presbyteries. The Independents gave in the Reasons of their dissent therefrom. These are in the hands of a committee. The answer is like to be full and satisfactory to the world, and possibly to the parties themselves. In a few days all we have done about Government will be sent up to the Houses, against which the Independents will have nothing considerable to say more than is in their papers against Presbyteries. But that which most comforts us is the Directory. All that we have done in it is this day sent up, with a full unanimity of all. Many a wearisome debate has it cost us: but we hope the sweet fruit will overbalance the very great toil we had in it. The last passage was sensibly from God. After, with huge deal of ado, we passed the parts that concerned prayers, reading of Scripture, preaching, both the sacraments, ordination, and sanctification of the sabbath, there were many references to the Preface; one, to turn the Directory to a straight Liturgy; another, to make it so loose and free that it should serve for little use: but God helped us to get both these rocks eschewed. Always [However] here-yesterday, [the day before yesterday], when we were at the very end of it, the Independents brought us so doubtful a disputation, that we were in very great fear all should be cast in the hows [difficulties,] and that their opposition to the whole Directory should be as great as to the Government, yet God, in his mercy, guided it so that yesterday we got them and all others, so satisfied that,

^a See back, p. 259.

^b Let. 84, p. 71.

nemine contradicente, it was ordered all together to be transmitted to the Houses, and Goodwin to be one of the carriers; which was this day done, to all our great joy, and hope that this will be a good ground of agreeance betwixt us and them, either soon or syne [sooner or later]. What remains of the Directory, anent [concerning] marrying and burial, will soon be despatched. The Catechism is drawn up, and, I think, shall not take up much time. I fear the Confession of Faith may stick longer. However, we will, by God's help, have so much work done in a month, that it seems necessary to have a General Assembly in Scotland shortly, that some of us may bring there what here has been so long in doing, to be revised, and, I hope, without great difficulty to be passed. If it please the Lord to perfect this work it will be the sweetest and most happy business that ever in this isle was enterprised.^a

In another, "December 1st," Baillie informs his countrymen that "After two days of tough debate and great appearance of irreconcilable differences, thanks to God, we have got the Independents satisfied, and a unanimous consent of all the Assembly, that Marriage shall be celebrated only by the minister, and that in the church, after our fashion. There are whisperings of good appearance that the Independents will be gotten contented to take up their 'Reasons' and submit themselves to the Assembly. If this be, it were better than a new victory over the king's army [!] Who knows what reward the Lord may give us for our great patience and love to these, however very good, yet very dangerous and unhappy, men, who have been the great and mighty instruments to keep all things here loose both in church and state, these two years bygone, for the increasing of their party to so great a strength, that they might by fear and threats obtain their desires. But these four months bygone, since we set our face against them openly, their plots are so broken, and their strength decayed, that I hope God will make them more pliable to reason than otherwise they were inclined. . . Matters here stand thus: the House of Commons have passed without any variation, to 'count of, all the Directory we sent them; and, I hope, to-morrow will send it to the Lords to make an Ordinance upon it. In the Assembly we have stuck longer than we expected on Marriage: but I hope to-morrow we shall end it; and before this day week we shall pass the two remanent parts of the Directory, fasting and burial, or visitation of the sick; also that we shall, one of the days of this week, send up the rest of our votes of Government, except we fall in debate of some passages of our too large 'Answer' to the Independents' 'Reasons' against Presbyteries. . .

"Lieutenant-general Cromwell has publicly, in the House of Commons, accused my lord of Manchester of the neglect of fighting at Newbury. . . The fault is unjustly laid on Manchester: it was common to all the general officers then present, and to Cromwell himself as much as to any other. Always [However,] Manchester has cleared himself abundantly in the House of Lords, and there has recriminated Cromwell as one who has avowed his desire to abolish the nobility of England; who has spoken contumeliously of the Scots' intention of coming into England to establish their church-government, in which

^a Let. 85, p. 73.

Cromwell said he would draw his sword against them ; also, against the Assembly of Divines ; and has threatened to make an army of Sectaries to extort by force, both from King and Parliament, what conditions they thought meet. This fire was long under the embers ; now it is broken out, we trust, in a good time. It is like, for the interest of our nation, we must crave reason of that darling of the Sectaries ; and in obtaining of his removal from the army, which himself by his own rashness has procured, to break the power of that potent faction. This is our present difficult exercise. We had need of your prayers.”^a

To Spang, December 6th : “ This week after many sharp debates we have agreed, and sent up to the Houses, our Directory for marriage and days of thanksgiving ; also we have, with much difficulty, passed a proposition for abolishing their ceremonies at burial : but our difference about funeral sermons seems irreconcilable, as it has been here and everywhere preached. It is nothing but an abuse of preaching, to serve the humours only of rich people for a reward... It is here a good part of the ministers’ livelihood ; therefore they will not quit it. After three days’ debate, we cannot find yet a way of agreeance. If this were passed, there is no more in our Directory, but fasting and holidays, wherein we apprehend no difference. Upon these, with our votes of Government already passed, and our answers to the Independents’ ‘ Reasons,’ the next week, I think, will be spent. The Letter of your Classis before Apollonius’s book was read the other day, and a printed copy of his book given to every member of the Assembly. It was not only very well taken, but also, which is singular and so far as I remember *absque exemplo*, it was ordered, *nemine contradicente*, to write a Letter of thanks to Apollonius. Surely he has done a piece of good service to God and his churches here. I have not yet had leisure to read it all [!] but I approve what I have read.

“ This matter of Cromwell, has been a high and mighty plot of the Independent party to have gotten an army for themselves under Cromwell, with the ruin and shamefully unjust crushing of Manchester’s person, of dissolving the union of the nations, of abolishing the House of Lords, of dividing the House of Commons, of filling the city and most of the Commons with intestine wars, of setting up themselves upon the ruins of all : but God, who has drawn us out of many desperate dangers, is like to turn this dangerous mischief on the heads of the contrivers. I hope it shall break the far more supposed than real strength of that party, and unite us more strongly ; but we are yet wrestling with them.”^b

A “ Public Letter,” December 26th, states as follows : “ The thing which now is spoken of here, is the sudden and unexpected work of yesterday : the House of Commons in one hour has ended all the quarrels which were betwixt Manchester and Cromwell ; all the obloquies against the General ; the grumblings against the proceedings of many in their House : they have taken all Office from all the members of both Houses ! This done on a sudden, in one session, with great unanimity, is still more and more admired by some as a most wise, necessary, and heroic action ; by the other, as the most rash, hazardous,

^a Let. 86, p. 74—76.

^b Let. 87, p. 76, 77.

and unjust action as ever Parliament did. Much may be said on both hands, but as yet it seems a dream, and the bottom of it is not understood. We pray God it may have a good success.

“We daily now make good progress in the Assembly. We have sent up our Directory for marriage and thanksgiving; we have also got through burial. We have some little things to say of fasting and visiting of the sick; and so our long-looked-for Directory will be closed. It is exceedingly liked by all who see it. Every piece of it passes the Houses as fast as we send it. Our ‘Answers’ to the Independents’ ‘Reasons’ are now ready, and I hope this week may be sent up to the House. We have also put together all our votes of Government, and will send them up to-morrow to both Houses. The Independents have entered their dissent only to three propositions: ‘That in Ephesus, was a classical presbytery: That there is a subordination in assemblies: That a single congregation has not all and sole power of ordination.’ Their ‘Reasons’ against these three propositions we expect to-morrow. Against the end of next week we hope our committees will have answers ready to all they will say; and after all is sent up to the House, by God’s help we expect shortly an erection of presbyteries and synods here; for there appears a good forwardness to expedite all things of that kind, in both Houses, since the taking of Newcastle. If the Directory and Government were once out of our hands, as a few days will put them, then we will fall on our great question of Excommunication, the Catechism, and Confession. There is here matter to hold us long enough if the wrangling humour which long predominated in many here, did continue; but thanks to God, that is much abated, and all incline towards a conclusion. We have drawn up a Directory for church-censures and excommunication; wherein we keep the practice of our church, but decline speculative questions. This we hope will please all who are not Independents; yea, I think even they needed not differ with us here: but it yet appears they will to separation, and are not so careful to accommodate as conscience would command peaceable men to be. However, we hope to get the debates of these things we most feared either eschewed or shortened. We have near also agreed in private, on a draught of Catechism; whereupon, when it comes in public, we expect little debate. I think we must either pass the Confession to another season, or, if God will help us, the heads of it being distribute among so many able hands, it may in a short time be so drawn up as the debates of it may cost little time. . . I trust this shall be the last which I shall write from this; for Mr. Gillespie and I being appointed to attend the General Assembly, purpose, if God will, shortly to take journey. We hope, this day, to close in the Assembly the remainder of our Directory, and to send it up to-morrow to the Houses; so the next week we expect an Ordinance of Parliament for the whole Directory. We have transmitted our ‘Answers’ to the Independents’ ‘Reasons’ against our Presbytery. They are well taken, and now upon the press.”^a

The next day Baillie wrote thus, to Spang, under the signature of “Jamesone:” “We have ended, this day, the Directory in the Assem-

^a Let. 88, p. 78—80.

bly. The Houses are through the most of it already. Before we go, they will pass all. What remains of the Government, concerning the hard questions of Excommunication, Mr. Henderson has drawn it up by way of a practical directory, so calmly, that we trust to get it all past the Assembly next week, without much debate. The men whom most we feared profess their satisfaction with that draught. It is certainly true of what you wrote, of the impossibility ever to have gotten England reformed by human means as things here stood, without their brethren's help. The learnedest and most considerable part of them were fully Episcopal: of these who joined with the Parliament, the greatest and most countenanced part were much Episcopal. The Independents had brought the people to such a confusion that was insuperable by all the wit and strength which was here; but God has so guided it, that all has contributed for the main work. The wickedness of the Popish and Prelatical faction still continuing and increasing; the horrible extravagancies of the Sectaries; the unreasonable obstinacy of the Independents; the strange confusions of this long anarchy; and, most of all, God's good hand on us here in the Assembly, and on our armies in the fields, has contribute to dispose this land to a very fair reformation above all their hopes."^a

By what is called a "Memorandum to Mr. Buchanan,"^b some insight has been obtained of what preceded the two next Letters found in numerical succession, and, like the "Memorandum," without dates. The first of these is headed "For Mr. Buchanan, at Paris," and it is another proof of the difficulty which the intriguers met with to obtain satisfaction in the prosecution of their "canny" devices. "Monsieur, —At my first sight of your papers, if I mistake not the sense, I remark sundry passages which I conceive would much prejudice our cause [!] if the writ went abroad without some alterations. . . The Divine right of the whole Congregation to give voice and suffrage in matters of government, is avowed. This is one of the greatest grounds of the Independents. What the Word of God grants to the People we may not deny them, and no posterior canon of the church can take from them. Of all that here is said against the Independents there is very little to the point; for they will grant it all, and deny they maintain any such independency as here is impugned. They avow a dependency, and that by Divine command, on all the neighbour-churches; only deny a superiority of jurisdiction of any church or synod over another church. In my judgment, these and such-like grounds, give much more advantage to the Prelatical and Independent party against us than we can get of all the rest of the writ against them. . . I have conferred with Mr. Henderson. We are both in opinion that you, in your way, the best you can, would [should] essay to get your friends so informed that they, in forenamed points, would write according to the mind of our church [!] or if this cannot be obtained, with all thankfulness to themselves for their hearty affection to our cause, you will so guide it that they may be silent [!] till they see what it may be the will of God to do with these poor distressed churches."^c

The second, "To Mr. Buchanan," tells this "Monsieur" that the

^a Let. 89, p. 81, 82.

^b See back, p. 434, Let. 53.

^c Let. 90, p. 83, 84.

Independents “profess to regard nothing at all what all the Reformed, or all the world, say, if their sayings be not backed with convincing Scriptures or reason. All human testimonies they declaim against as a Popish argument. So far as yet we perceive, they will separate from all the Reformed, and will essay, by all they can either do or suffer, to have their new way advanced. The sooner all the Reformed declare against them, it will be the better.”^a

At this place in the volume is preserved “My Assembly-Speech,” without a date, but delivered January 23rd, 1644-5, when Baillie had returned with Gillespie professedly to communicate what progress they and their fellow-commissioners had made in the general church and state affairs for which they had been deputed: chiefly “for the furthering and advancement in that uniformity in Divine worship and church-government which both nations have sworn in their Solemn League and Covenant.”^b

^a Let. 91, p. 85.—As part of the proceedings of this year, the following article is taken from the Acts of the National Synod of the Reformed Churches of France assembled, by permission of the King, at Charenton, December 26th, etc. “UPON what has been reported by some Deputies from the Maritime Provinces, That many coming from foreign countries, and who call themselves ‘Independents,’—because they teach that each particular church ought to be governed by its own laws, without any dependence on persons and matters ecclesiastical, and without obligation to recognise the authority of Conferences [Colloques], and Synods for its government and conduct,—fixing their abode in this kingdom, and who might hereafter cause great inconveniences if there were not, in good time, care taken: The Assembly,—fearing that the contagion of this venom increasing insensibly, will spread confusion and disorder among us; and judging the said sect of the Independents not only prejudicial to the Church of God, insomuch that it endeavours to introduce confusion, opening the door to all sorts of singularities and extravagancies, and removing all means of providing the remedy for it; but so very dangerous to the State that, if it should have room, it could not but produce as many religions as there are parishes, or particular congregations;—enjoins to every Province, and especially the Maritime, to take care that the evil do not take hold in churches of this kingdom, in order that peace and uniformity as well in religion as in discipline should be inviolably preserved, and that nothing be introduced among us which can alter in any way the service due to God and to the King. —Garrissoles, Moderator: Basnage, Assistant: Blondel and Le Coq, Secretaries.”

^b No. 92, p. 85.—In the course of this speech, Baillie tells the “Right Honourable, Right Reverend Fathers and Brethren,” . . . “The success which God, according to your prayers, hath been pleased to grant to our labour, you will better see than we can repeat, in the papers which we have brought. . . We can add nothing to that which from these Letters you will hear read: only, with your Reverences’ permission and favour, we are bold to profess that God has done great things for poor Scotland. . . When the Bishops of England had put upon the neck of our church and nation the yoke first of their Episcopacy, then of their Ceremonies; the whole mass of a Service-book, and with it the body of Popery; . . to have had Bishops, Ceremonies, Book, and State-slavery reformed, we would lately have esteemed it a mercy above all our praises. But now, beholding the progress of the Lord, how He has led us by the hand, and marched before us to the homes and holds of our injurious oppressors; how there he has made bare his holy arm, and brought the wheel of his vengeance upon the whole race and order of Prelates in England, and has plucked up the root and all the branches of Episcopacy in all the King’s dominions; that an Assembly and Parliament in England unanimously, but which is their word ‘abolished,’ not only these Ceremonies which troubled us but the whole Service-book as ‘a very idol,’ so speak they also, and a vessel full of much mischief; that in place of Episcopacy, a Scots Presbytery should be concluded in an English Assembly, and ordained in an English Parliament, as it is

CHAP. LVIII.

THE REASONS OF THE INDEPENDENTS; OR, THE GRAND DEBATE.

IN page 457, it was seen that the Presbyterians had transmitted certain papers to the press. We know not whether they appeared publicly, before the date upon this title, "The Reasons presented by the Dissenting Brethren, against certain Propositions concerning Presbyterial Government: and the Proofs of them, voted by the Assembly of Divines sitting, by Authority of Parliament, at Westminster. Together with the Answer of the Assembly of Divines, to those Reasons of Dissent. 1648. 4to." pp. 211 [221]. That title-page was cancelled, in the year 1652, and the following substituted; all else being the same: "The Grand Debate concerning Presbytery and Independency, by the Assembly of Divines convened at Westminster, by Authority of Parliament: Containing, First, The Assembly's Propositions, with the Proof of them from Scripture, concerning the Presbyterial Government: Secondly, The Dissenting Brethren's Reasons against the said Propositions: Thirdly, The Answer of the Assembly to those Reasons of Dissent.—Examined and Perused by Jer. Whitaker; Tho. Goodwin. By Order of Parliament."

The whole of the contents relating to the Independents is before the reader, who is unavoidably referred to the original volume for the "Answers" of the Presbyterians, arrogating as above, to be "The Assembly of Divines" exclusive of their "Dissenting Brethren." The value of the "Reasons" may be estimated by the labour bestowed with the design of subverting them, and by their being part and parcel of the bases on which the principles of Scriptural Independency are established; time, and further scrutiny, having tested their general correctness. The "Answers" could they be given, would show a vast complication of hypotheses, with occasional instances of acuteness, and others of soreness; the latter more particularly when the argument

already ordained in the House of Commons; that the practice of the Church of Scotland, set down in a most wholesome, pious, and prudent Directory, should come in the place of a Liturgy in all the three dominions;—such stories, lately told, would have been counted fancies, dreams, mere impossibilities: yet this day we tell them as truths, and deeds done, for the great honour of our God, and we are persuaded, the joy of many a godly soul! If any will not believe our report, let them trust their own eyes; for behold here the warrant of our words, written and subscribed by the hands of the Clerks of the Parliament of England, and the Scribes of the Assembly there! We will not descend into any particulars; . . . only it is our earnest desire that the mercies whereof we are speaking, may be matter of thankfulness to all; a door of hope to fainting and feeble minds, who are oft miscarried with fear what yet may be the event; a certain ground of clear despair to all the enemies of Zion, that they may give over their vain labour, and cease to oppose the work of God whether by their secret obstructions or open hostility, knowing that it will be hard for them to kick against the pricks, and that there is neither wisdom nor strength against the Lord. . . . We all hope that the chariot of the Lord will not here stand, nor be arrested within the compass of this isle."

exhibits a parallel between routed Prelacy and aspiring Presbytery. The struggle, in the Assembly, was most vigorous upon the point now presented.

“ The THIRD PROPOSITION, concerning Presbyterian Government, as it was voted in the ASSEMBLY, and sent up to both Houses of Parliament.

“ The Scripture doth hold forth, That many particular congregations may be under one presbyterial government :

“ This proposition is proved by instances :

“ I. Instance, Of the church of JERUSALEM ; which consisted of more congregations than one, and all those congregations were under one presbyterial government.—This appeareth thus, i. The church of Jerusalem consisted of more congregations than one, as is manifest, 1. By the multitude of Believers,—mentioned in divers texts collated,—both *before* the dispersion of the believers there by means of the persecution mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, ch. viii. in the beginning thereof; witness Acts i. 11 ; ii. 41, 46, 47 ; iv. 4 ; v. 14 ; and vi. 1, 7 : and also, *after* the dispersion ; Acts ix. 31 ; xii. 24 ; and xxi. 20.—2. By the many apostles and other preachers, in the church of Jerusalem. If there were but one congregation there, then each apostle preached but seldom ; which will not consist with Acts vi. 2.—3. The diversity of languages amongst the believers mentioned both in the 2nd and 6th chapters of the Acts, doth argue more congregations than one in that church. ii. All those congregations were under one presbyterial government: because, 1. They were one church ; Acts viii. 1, and ii. 47, compared with v. 11, xii. 5, and xv. 4.—2. The elders of that church, are mentioned Acts xi. 30 ; xv. 4, 6, 22 ; xxi. 17, 18.—3. The apostles did the ordinary acts of presbyters, as presbyters, in that church ; which proveth a presbyterial church *before* the dispersion ; Acts vi.—4. The several congregations in Jerusalem being one church, the elders of that church are mentioned as meeting together for acts of government, Acts xi. 30 ; xv. 4, 6, 22 ; xxi. 17, 18, and so forwards : which proves that these several congregations were under one presbyterial government. And, whether these congregations were fixed, or not fixed, in regard of officers or members ; it is all one, as to the truth of the Proposition. Nor doth there appear any material difference betwixt the several congregations in Jerusalem and the many congregations now, in the ordinary condition of the church, as to the points of fixedness in regard of officers or members. *Therefore*, The Scripture doth hold forth, That many congregations may be under one presbyterial government.

“ II. Instance : Of the church of EPHESUS. For, i. That there were more congregations than one, in the church of Ephesus ; appears by Acts xx. 31, where is mention of Paul’s continuance at Ephesus, in preaching for ‘ the space of three years ’ : and Acts xix. 18—20, where the especial effect of ‘ the Word ’ is mentioned ; and verses 10 and 17, where is a distinction of ‘ Jews and Greeks ’ : and and 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9, where is a reason of Paul’s stay at Ephesus ‘ until Pentecost ’ ; and verse 19, where is mention of a particular church ‘ in the house ’ of Aquila and Priscilla then at Ephesus, as appeareth Acts xviii. 19, 24, 26. All which laid together do *prove*, That the multitude of believers did make more congregations than one, in the church of Ephesus.—ii. That there were many elders over these many congregations as one flock ; appeareth Acts xx. 17, 25, 28, 30, 36.—iii. That those many congregations were one church ; and that they were under one presbyterial government ; appeareth Rev. ii. 1—6, joined with Acts xx. 17, 28.”^a

“ REASONS, AGAINST ‘ The Third Proposition, concerning Presbyterian Government,’ and the Principles thereof.

“ ‘ If many congregations,’ having all elders already affixed respectively unto them, ‘ may be under one presbyterial government : ’ then, all those elders must sustain a *special* relation of elders to all the people of those congregations, as one church, and to every one as a member thereof. But, for a company of such

^a Introduc.

elders already affixed, etc., to sustain such a relation; carries with it so great and manifold incongruities and inconsistencies, with what the Scripture speaks of elders, in their relation to a church committed to them, and likewise with the Principles of the Reformed Churches themselves, as cannot be admitted. And, *therefore*, such a government may not be.

“ The First Proposition: That according to the Scriptures,—Such a presbyterial government, necessarily draws such a *special* relation; is evinced by parts thus: i. They must have the relation of elders to all and every one of the members: for, church and elders, are relative. And the Argument, for the presbyterial government, is taken by the Presbyterial Divines from this, That many congregations, in Scripture, are made one church; and the elders thereof, elders of that church. ii. That relation they have, must be a more special relation; as is evident from the practice and principles of this Government: for, when the congregations in Shires are divided into several presbyteries, or deaneries, the elders—though neighbours—of a bordering presbytery intermeddle not with the congregations under another presbytery, and yet neighbour-elders! It is, therefore, a special relation, puts the difference, that those of these presbyteries do judge the congregations under them; as having a special relation to them, such as not to other congregations.

“ THE MINOR PROPOSITION: For the proof of which, we present these *Incongruities*, as follow:

“ First, This breeds many incongruous disproportions to the order, set by Christ, about the officers of the church: i. To extend a pastor's power of ordinarily ruling, beyond the extent of his ordinary teaching; is against the order which Christ hath set,—and all extent of power, must as well have an institution of Christ, as the power or office itself; the difference of evangelists and ordinary pastors, lay in extent of power;—*but* the extent of a pastor's ordinary ruling power is but to that flock, as his whole flock, which he is able to feed. The first proposition [here] is confirmed, first by Scripture; secondly, by Reason.

“ 1. By Scripture: Acts xx. 28; whence, first, we see the special limitation of their extensive power and relation; to a ‘flock,’ and ‘all’ in that flock, is by ‘the Holy Ghost’ and not by man; and, therefore, is not to be extended by man, further than the Holy Ghost hath appointed. Secondly, The extent of that relation; to that ‘flock,’ and the whole flock they ‘feed,’ and to feed ‘all’ that ‘flock’ alike: and, if they be preaching elders, then to feed by preaching; and, therefore, are ‘overseers’ to them to feed them, and this because they feed them. Thirdly, He [Paul] speaks to preaching elders especially, that feed by doctrine: for he propounds his own example unto them, verses 20, 27. And Peter seconds Paul in this, 1 Pet. v. 2: ‘the flock’ ἐν ὑμῖν,—‘among you,’ is that flock any of them had relation to, as his ‘flock’ respectively: Peter here writing unto the churches in several nations, ch. i. 1; whereas in Acts xx. 28, the charge is to the particular elders of Ephesus, to that whole ‘flock:’ therefore, that note, of respectiveness, is here put ἐν ὑμῖν—‘among you;’ that is, that ‘flock’ which,

respectively, belongs to you ; as Col. i. 7, ‘ who is for you a faithful minister,’ that is—your proper pastor. So the ‘ flock’ ἐν ὑμῖν, is your several proper flocks that belong to you. And hereby it appears, that their ‘ oversight’ is not extendible beyond their feeding. Thus also, Heb. xiii. 7, which he speaks of preaching elders ; and of ruling elders, ver. 17. And whether these places note out two sorts of officers or but one sort, and so but several acts of the same office ; however, if but one, yet still the ordinary ‘ rule’ over them was not further extendible than their ordinary preaching : if two sorts of officers,—they being officers together in the same church,—if the pastor’s power of ruling extends no further than his preaching, then the mere ruling elder’s power—or his that is assistant to him—must extend no further than the pastor’s also : this is the natural obligation to obedience, and so is the measure to set the bounds of the extent of ordinary church-power. It is one argument used against Episcopal power, that they are enforced to obey him that speaks not the Word to them, nor watches over their souls ; and this holds as well, against these *Presbyterial* officers, when a man, to be excommunicated, comes before such, if he says—I am not bound to obey you in such an authoritative way ; nor do I owe a subjection, as to a power of censure in you ; for many, yea most of you, never spake the Word unto me, nor did ‘ watch’ over my soul : nay, perhaps the man can say, he never saw their faces afore. And it avails not to say, That they may, occasionally, preach : for, take two places more ; the 1 Thess. v. 12, speaking of respect to their officers, these two, ‘ labour’ and ‘ are over you,’ are commensurable, that is—Who make it their calling, to have a care of you ; which the many pastors and elders, in a common presbytery, cannot : and, ‘ labour’ in what ? 1 Tim. v. 17, expounds it, That ‘ labour in the word and doctrine.’ And expound, this latter known place, whether of teaching-elders only, or ruling and teaching both,—as the Reformed Churches do,—however, it affords this to us, That the extent of ruling, in either the one or the other, is but as large as teaching : and if it be meant of teaching-elders only, that [who] both ‘ rule’ and ‘ labour in the word and doctrine ;’ yet if they be limited in labouring ‘ in the word’—as they are, being fixed pastors to their own congregations,—then, ‘ in ruling : and if it be meant of ruling-elders, as distinct from them [the teaching], yet their ruling is but of the same extent that the others,’ labouring ‘ in the word,’ is ; and that is, extended but to one congregation !

“ 2. Reason is for this : for in a pastor’s office in which preaching and ruling are joined, yet his power of ruling flows in him from, and is, the adjunct of his power to preach : and, to be sure, it is not extendible further : and, however, yet there is the same proportion of either ; and then, by just reason, the extent of the church which is the subject of his ordinary ruling, cannot be extended larger than what is the ordinary subject of his preaching : and so, these relations are of equal limits. If a father hath the power of governing, as a father, then it is extendible only to those he is a father to. And, that a pastor hath his ordinary ruling-power annexed to his ordinary power of preaching ; is proved by these reasons : first, If not upon this ground,

then upon some other : not by any special faculty and office over and above this—of preaching ; for then he should be ordained a ruling-elder over and above his being first a preaching-elder, as a new faculty given him ; or, by being made a ruler first, and then this, of preaching, superadded, as the bishops first made deacons, then presbyters. But, secondly, All the keys are given him at once ; the keys of ruling with the keys of knowledge : the power of the staff intrinsically follows his being a pastor or shepherd. And though the one is a power of mere order, namely, that of preaching ; and that of his ruling, be a power of jurisdiction—to be exercised with others, and not alone—yet still his receiving power to join with others in those acts of rule of jurisdiction, is from this his power of order ; and the ordinary extent of his authority therein, is extendible no further than his ordinary call to preach. Yea, thirdly, The extent of the power of the apostles themselves, in ruling in all the churches, was founded upon and extendible with their commission to preach in all churches ; and their very call and obligation being, not to preach in a set, fixed relation, as ordinary pastors' calling is, but to all churches in all nations, hence, their power of ruling was answerable. It was their very call, to be universal pastors ; and, therefore, to be universal rulers : yea, and in reference to those that are 'without,' their authority of ruling was narrower, in the extent of it, than of their preaching. The apostles might preach to [the] heathen, and their call was so to do, to convert them ; but they had not power to 'rule' all men : 1 Cor. v. 12. But in this way of Presbyterian Government, though they also may, occasionally preach where they may not 'rule,' yet the proportion of their ordinary ruling is extended beyond the proportion of their ordinary preaching ; which it was not, in the apostles themselves !

" ii. It breeds an incongruous disproportion between the offices of ruling and preaching elders, compared among themselves ; for this government, makes this extent of the ruling-elders' office and relation, to be larger than that of their teachers' or pastors' : for the pastor, *quâ* pastor, is limited to his particular congregation he is fixed to, for the ordinary performance of his office ; as the deacons also are ; but the ruling-elder's office, *quâ* ruling-elder, is extended over all these congregations in this presbytery. The ruling-elder performs his office in the highest perfection of it ; as, to admonish, excommunicate, in all these churches ; but the pastors are limited, in the highest work of their callings,—preaching being more excellent than ruling, yea, than baptizing is,—unto one congregation : that, in 1 Tim. v. 17,—interpret it as you will !—justifies this.

" iii. It perverts the order and distinction of teaching-elders and mere ruling-elders—as the Reformed Churches call them ;—or church-governors, as the Assembly ; that, whereas Christ hath made some, teaching-elders ; and some, ruling-elders ; and these distinct in this, That the preaching-elder's office is to preach and rule ; the ruling-elder's office only to rule ; this frame of Presbyterian Government makes one person not only to do both these works—which, in a Particular Congregation, every pastor doth ;—but, formally, to bear both these offices in respect of a double relation he doth sustain, namely, of a

pastor,—to be a preaching-elder to the congregation where he is fixed, and a mere ruling-elder to the rest of the congregations of the Classical church. For it is demanded, when a pastor in a particular congregation is in this common presbytery, What sort of officer he is, to that presbyterial church? An elder he is; because he doth the work of an elder: a teaching-elder, to that church, he is not; for to that whole church he labours not ‘in the word and doctrine:’ therefore, a mere ruling-elder he must be, and so the same man bears two sorts of offices; and, by this means, there are two sorts of mere ruling-elders. Whereas in a Particular Congregation, a pastor though he rules, yet he ruleth as a pastor to that congregation! And this disorder and confusion are further set out in that, by this means, the same officer hath a full relation to one church, and but half a relation to another; and causeth him to perform the whole of his office to one church—the particular church he hath relation to,—and but the half thereof to the other.

“iv. It makes an incongruous disproportion between the extent of the relation of those two offices, of elders and deacons, unto a church. If the Scriptures had intended many churches making one church; and the elders of those many churches, to have been elders in common to those churches as one church; then, in like manner, the deacons of all those churches should make up a common deaconry, and be deacons in common unto all those churches, in an ordinary way, as the other are elders. But this is contrary to the practice of the Reformed Churches, though subject to the presbyterial government; in which, the deacons have the ordinary relation of deacons in no respect extended further than to a particular congregation: nor do they exercise acts of that office, in an ordinary way, to other congregations, nor otherwise to neighbour congregations than to any other; much less is there a common deaconship of them all. And why should not the latter be erected over all those churches as one church, as well as a common eldership? Especially if in matters of this nature, *par ratio* should carry it; every church, *quæ* church, being a body, hath a relation to all its officers, as organical members thereof: so Rom. xii. 4. And the apostle writing to Philippi, a church in a city, writes to the ‘bishops’—the elders—and the ‘deacons,’ as both alike officers of that church: Phil. i. 1. And Acts vi., the deacons of the church of Jerusalem—if there were many congregations, as our Brethren suppose,—were chosen by the whole ‘multitude’ when gathered together by ‘the twelve;’ and, therefore, were deacons of the whole church, as well as the elders, elders thereof! Now, if the deacon’s office should thus be extended to all the congregations, as the elder’s is; then, why should not each church be bound to bring contributions to the deacons of each church, to be distributed in common? And so, our purses should be subject to the deacons in common, as far as our persons to the elders in common; and they might challenge the same power, in their office, over the one, that the elders do over the other: and then also, each congregation were, in an ordinary and standing obligation, bound to relieve all the poor in those churches, as well as those in their own parishes, not only by the common law of charity, but by virtue of special relation of their

being one church ; which relation, in all these things, doth beget the like obligation that it doth in government ; and so, all things of this nature should be alike common to all and each, and there should be a common treasury for this one great *diaconate* church, as we may, in a parallel allusion to that other name of *presbyterial*, call it.

“ A second head, Of *Incongruities*, and Inconsistencies which will follow upon it ; are [is] in the mutual duties required, and that do, necessarily, follow upon this standing relation for a constant government of these elders to all this people of these churches, and of the people to these elders.

“ 1. From the people, to all these elders. According unto what the Scripture speaks of as due to standing elders, they owe at least ‘honour’ and ‘esteem’ [1 Thess. v. 13.]; yea, maintenance to all their elders, whether those that ordinarily ‘rule’ them, or preach to them, and they owe it for both : 1 Tim. v. 17, 18. Which ‘honour’ is expressed by the analogy of that law, ver. 18. And this is certainly due to elders, for all that is the work of elders ; whether performed apart, or together by way of jurisdiction in a presbytery : and it cannot be denied but that their constant ruling, as in the presbytery, is one great part of the work of elders, and so must be here intended, for which an especial ‘honour’ is due. And as they are to ‘feed’ all and every one in ‘the flock’—as Acts xx. 28.—so maintenance and honour, are due from all people to all and every one of these elders ; as well to those that ‘rule,’ as those that ‘labour in the word and doctrine.’ And, in reason, if ‘the elders that rule well’—and perform the lesser acts of ruling—in their particular congregations and the presbyteries thereof, are to have this ‘honour’ in their relations ; then all those ‘elders that rule well’ in the common presbytery—and perform the greatest acts of ruling—are to have the like from all that classical-church ; the emphasis being put upon ruling ‘well.’ And, in those acts done by them, the excellency of ruling consisteth ; and the precept is not to ‘honour’ *presbyteries* in some abstract notion, but ‘elders’ : because the particular persons of the elders are to be the object of it ; and those most, who excel most in that ‘rule,’—that rule ‘well’ or best ! But when there are many congregations that have their proper fixed pastors and elders, whom they maintain for performing one part of the elder’s work,—for they perform but one part of it,—how shall they perform this due [duty] to all the rest, for that other part of it ? And it is due from every person as he is able ; or he [the fixed pastor] cannot perform his duty. How burdensome, how confused, would this be ? And then, how to proportion this ; suppose it should not be maintenance, but ‘honour’ and ‘esteem,’ this people will not be able to judge : not only for that they cannot be present at their work, and so cannot judge of it, but because either it must be proportioned to them as constant preaching-elders or as ruling ; not as to preaching-elders, for they ‘labour’ not to them as such,—the ground upon which it is required is, that they ‘tread out’ their ‘corn,’ 1 Tim. v. 18.—and to ‘honour’ and ‘esteem’ them as ruling-elders only, were to honour preaching-elders below the rank and degree of their office.

“ So, 2dly ; It brings the like Incongruities upon the performance

of those duties of elders, which the New Testament indifferently requires of all those that it acknowledgeth to be elders unto a people; and, therefore, no such constant relation of elders to so many churches, may be! As first, praying with the 'sick,' Jas. v. 14. What! are these elders of a *presbyterial* church bound hereto? This duty lies in common upon 'elders' of churches; and how shall we distinguish, when the Scripture doth not? Secondly; visiting 'from house to house,' as Paul, in his example, instructs 'the elders' of Ephesus, Acts xx. 20. Thirdly; watching over men's 'souls, as they that must give account,' Heb. xiii. 17. To 'watch' is not to stay till causes are brought by appeals, or so, from the congregations; but, personally, to observe and oversee them, as 'souls' committed to them which they must give an 'account' for. Fourthly; of preaching—if preaching-elders—'in season, and out of season,' 2 Tim. iv. 2. The Bishops! they said, the 'flock' was theirs, and the whole care committed to them: and to solve the Incongruity of not being able to preach, themselves, to them, they professed a derivative delegated power to inferior pastors whom they called their 'curates.' This was plain dealing. But these Elders! make all the whole flock theirs; and this, from those Scriptures that speak of 'elders' and 'flock'; and themselves not 'curates,' and so personally obliged, according to the rules in Scripture; and yet cannot perform it: which is a worse Incongruity! If it be said, That they may part these duties among them: *Ubi Scriptura non distinguit, nec nos debemus distinguere.* Now, all those duties, that are spoken of elders to the flocks, they are without distinction as in respect of the object to whom they are extended. Paul saith to those of Ephesus, 'feed the *flock*;' Peter the like, to those he writes to; the 'flock,' ἐν ὑμῖν respectively, to 'feed' and take 'the oversight' of them: the author to the Hebrews, to 'watch' over their 'souls;' and, to the Thessalonians, he describes them to be those that are 'over' them, and 'labour,' and 'admonish' them. When those injunctions are thus laid upon all, how shall the consciences of Elders! be able to part and distinguish their discharge of them; and to say, Though I am an elder in common, to all in these congregations, yet I am bound but to govern them in greater matters, and to admonish them as with others when publicly met in a Consistory, and am bound to no other acts of eldership; and yet to this particular congregation, I am obliged to private admonition, rule, watchfulness, etc.! Where hath the Scripture set these 'bounds,' or thus parted them? And, therefore, certainly all these places hold forth singly, only the 'elders' and their duties of a particular church fixed thereto, as knowing no other. It was necessary, Christ should have set the bounds and given the distinction; and not indifferently lay all these upon all. And either, in these places, the duties of elders in a common presbytery are contained, and that under the notion of elders to those; or they are not to be found in the New Testament. And all these, may be brought, in several arguments alone by themselves, against the main Proposition; though here, they come in only as branches of the minor.

"Lastly: This is Inconsistent with the ordinary way of the Call of elders, held forth in the Word, and the principles of the Reformed

Churches. There are two parts of this Call : first, choice ; secondly, ordination.

“ First, for Choice : Chamier, in the name of all the Reformed Churches, allows the People this, The approbation of their elders : and so in Scotland. And if the apostles themselves allowed them the choice of the deacons that had the charge of the church-treasury, and took care of their bodies ; then, much more of their elders that have to do with their consciences ! Look ! whatever the right of the People is, in the choice of them that should preach to them ; there is as much reason they should have the exercise of it in the choice of those elders that, in a common presbytery, do rule over them, for they perform one part of the elder’s duty, namely, ruling ; as the preaching-elders do the other : and, therefore, by the equity of the same law that speaks of elders indefinitely, if they choose any elders as elders to them, they are to choose these also ; there being no distinction put of choosing preaching-elders only, but elders indefinitely. And further, the greatest and highest acts of power over them, are committed, in an ordinary way, unto them ; as of excommunication, of all punishments the most formidable : there is put as much, if not more than every man’s life, that is a member of that classical-church, into their hands, The enjoyment of all ordinances for ever : and so, the power of deposing their ministers already fixed to them, and of refusing to ordain them they shall approve : and, therefore, in Antiquity, of all other, the persons of the bishops who had the power of all those, were chosen by all the People, and by *panegyric*al meetings [general assemblies]. And [in the second place] it is strengthened by this further parallel : A minister’s Call hath two parts ; first, ordination, which belongs to the elders ; secondly, choice, in which the people have some interest. These elders as elders in common, and these congregations as one church, be relatives ; and so, that interest which a church, *quâ* church, hath, is commensurable to the interest of these elders, *quâ* elders : if, therefore, in ordaining, all the elders in a common presbytery do join to ordain an officer ; then, all the people, *quâ* church, must join in choosing or approving him : neither can their common right of choosing, be swallowed up by the interest of their elders ordaining him. And if it be said, They all choose, by virtue of the general law of combination ; as the Shires, Parliament-men : the constitution of the State makes the one ; if the like be found in Scripture, it will be sufficient ; but if not, but that this interest must be common to the people of the classical-church, it is asked, When a fixed pastor is to be chosen to a particular charge, what office he shall be chosen to, by the people of the other congregations ? Not to a pastor’s office ; he is not to be such to them ; if to be a ruling-elder only, then, besides that he hath two offices—as afore—so now he must have two choices and two ordinations ! *We* choose him for our pastor, says the particular church he belongs to ; and *we*, say the other, to ruling. And besides, in his ordination, the people have an interest of presence, and joining in the fasting and prayer at his ordination : and this, therefore, must be performed either in a *panegyric*al meeting, of all,—which cannot be,—or in all the several churches, which will multiply the ordination of them !

“THE MAJOR PROPOSITION CONFIRMED: In regard that the main argumentation of such as contend for a Presbyterial Government—as, in their writings and otherways, appears,—is, From the mention of ‘the elders’ of such and such a ‘church;’ as Jerusalem, etc.; having many congregations;—as they suppose: the consequence of the *major*, was taken so much for granted as, on all sides, agreed on; as it was less insisted upon the first day [of debate, in the Assembly]: but being denied, and answered thus, ‘That they bear not the relation of elders, but of a presbytery, *because* quod convenit toti quâ toti, non convenit cuilibet parti: and that elders, yet in sensu composito non diviso; as a colonel is a colonel to a particular regiment, but in a council of war not so to all regiments: a head of a particular tribe, is a head to his own tribe divisively, but not so to all the tribes; and the like.’

“i. For that logical axiom: It is true, quod convenit toti, etc.: and so here, that which doth competere toti, to the whole, of these elders, belongs not to every part: for take them all, as met together, they are a presbytery; and, accordingly, each elder, is not a presbytery to all these congregations; nor doth the argument suppose it, but only, that if they be a common presbytery to all these congregations, that they then bear the relation of elders: as, take a heap of stones; it is true each stone is not a heap of stones, but each stone is a stone in that heap: so, this company of elders, must be supposed both a presbytery and also elders to this whole people and every member of them! Which is further proved thus: 1. The Scriptures would have the people look at them, and ‘honour’ them, as elders in all acts of ruling as well as in preaching; and especially wherein the most and chief of ruling lies, and wherein the excellency of their ruling is seen: they rule most and best, when met in this common presbytery; upon that relation, we are bound to ‘honour’ them, as performing this rule; and under that relation they must be said to perform it: 1 Tim. v. 17. And besides, otherwise we destroy the relation of elders, quâ elders, in the highest acts of governing which are exercised only in a presbytery. 2. The New Testament doth, indifferently and promiscuously, use the word ‘presbytery’ and the word ‘elders’ of the same persons, in relation to the same people; and, therefore, to whom these elders are supposed to be a presbytery, they must bear the relation of elders. Matt. xxi. 23, [xxvii. 1.] those that are called ‘elders of the people,’ are called, Luke xxii. 66, πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ, ‘the presbytery of the people;’ so, as if they related as a ‘presbytery’ to the people, to the same people they related as ‘elders.’

“ii. For that distinction, of their being elders only in a community, to all those congregations as one church; in sensu aggregato, but not in sensu diviso, to every person thereof; as was instanced in ‘burgesses, etc.’ ‘First: This church, as it is totum aggregatum, is but an abstract notion; but the rule and government of the elders, in a presbytery, falls upon persons in particular and every member of that church: if, therefore, they be elders, in the presbytery, to that church, it must be that they are elders to every person therein. Again: It must be remembered where we are, namely, upon what ‘the Scriptures hold forth;’ so the proposition runneth. And if there had been

those differing relations of elders which, from those similitudes in commonwealths, armies, and the universities, are given, it were necessary the Scripture should have held it forth by like differing names and respects, or by differing charges ; whereby it might appear, that this relation obligeth them to *this* duty, and this other relation to *that* ; which being not done, is therefore, to us, a fiction. That it was necessary, appears from the instances themselves, : as in that of the ‘ tribes,’ there were general elders of all the tribes ; and there were—and, perhaps, some of them the same men—that were ‘ heads ’ and ‘ elders ’ of the particular tribes : but as this was a differing relation and respect in the same, or divers, persons ; so they had names and titles of difference and distinction ; for the ‘ heads ’-general, as we may call them, were called ‘ elders of the people ;’ the particular elders of particular tribes, were called, by the way of distinction from them [the former], ‘ elders ’ of such ‘ cities,’ ‘ families,’ etc. and there were as distinct laws given, in such cases : the elders of the several tribes did such and such particulars in their tribes respectively ; and the general elders, had reserved cases, of ‘ blasphemy,’ etc., set down by the Law. So, in that instance of the heads of colleges and heads of the university, there is as a differing so a distinguishing character : the names are changed ; the particular bodies are called colleges ; the general body, the university ; and their several special relations to their colleges, is [are] expressed by the title of ‘ masters ’ of such and such colleges ; and the others, by the title of ‘ heads ’ to the university. Yea, and accordingly, there are differing statutes : the local statutes, for each college apart, or for colleges as colleges ; and the duties of masters, in their special relations ; and there are statutes for the university, and their duties as heads thereof : and this distinction and difference was necessary, if there were this differing relation. But for the case in hand ; if we come to the New Testament, to find out these several jurisdictions and relations of elders ; therein, we still read, but simply and singly, ‘ elders,’ and ‘ churches ’ as relatives ; no such note of distinction ! And also, speaking of the duties of elders to the people, and people to elders, it speaks similarly and univocally : so as, whoever will take upon them to be elders, all those duties fall upon them ; let them distinguish, how they can ! And to confirm this, the instances in the *Minor* serve. And, where the Scripture doth not distinguish, we are not to distinguish. And if the elders of a particular congregation are elders to that church, both in sensu diviso—and every member thereof,—and also in sensu composito—in their presbyteries, unto the whole,—then, those general elders must bear the like relation to that classical-church and every member of it : else, the difference is so vast, and the consequent difference of duties, thereupon depending, such, as it was necessary a distinction should have been made in Scripture, that each might know their duties.

‘ If all the records, laws, and ruled cases, of this kingdom, should, in setting down the ordinary government thereof, have made mention only and singly of ‘ burgesses ’ as the rulers, and of ‘ corporations ’ as the correlate to them ; and used no other distinguishing word,

and there were undeniably ‘burgesses’ of every incorporate town continued from antiquity; if any would, afterwards, pretend that this word ‘corporation’ was intended, by our ancestors, to import an ‘association’ or community of many of these corporations into one shire; and that, by ‘burgesses’ of those corporations, were meant a ‘community’ of all those burgesses in one body, for government, and so pretend the same names, without distinction, and say they were also meant: yea, and further; if the laws and charters concerning such burgesses, in each corporation,—the duties given them in charge, by the laws, in their relations to their corporations,—did run without any distinction of what the burgesses, in the supposed greater corporation, should do in that relation and community, from which the same burgesses, in their lesser corporations, in a more proper relation do: yea, and if the duties set down in those laws, mutually between corporations, and those burgesses should argue an inconsistency with the government of burgesses over many corporations in common,—as the *Minor* here, shows it to be in our case,—but all naturally fall in with that of burgesses over single corporations: in this case, to say that therefore this kingdom did hold forth, there might not be—that is, according to the laws thereof—such a government of the burgesses of corporations over many corporations; were not this a right way of arguing, to overthrow such a pretence? And if, in answer to such arguments, it should be said, That both these might be consistent: for that in foreign states and kingdoms and societies there are burgesses of particular corporations, and there are burgesses in an assembly of parliament—so called, by way of distinction—met in common for the ordinary government of all those corporations in common; and, therefore, the like may be here, in this! The reply were easy, That whatever such distinction there is in other states, yet the question is of such burgesses as the laws of this state hold forth—the question is, of such burgesses as this kingdom hath set up—where there is no distinction of burgesses of corporations and burgesses in parliament mentioned; but, on the contrary, only one single uniform style and title in the laws, namely, burgesses of the corporation, and duties suited thereunto. Now, parallel to this case, are our arguments, and the answers given thereto.

Lastly; If they be elders only in sensu aggregato, yet so far as they are acknowledged thus, elders, so far will many of the Incongruities in the *Minor* follow them and fall upon them, as that still they are but—merely ruling-elders; and, that there be deacons—in sensu aggregato!”^a

“REASONS against, and EXCEPTIONS to the First Proof of the First Assertion: namely,

“‘That the church of JERUSALEM consisteth of more congregations than one; from ‘the multitude of believers.’”

“First, REASONS: To show there were *not* more than could meet in one place. The Holy Ghost, hath from first to last, as on purpose, showed this; as if his scope had been aforehand, to prevent and to preclude all reasonings to the contrary:

“i. In the beginnings of that church, their meetings are set out to us by two adjuncts : first, That they met *ὁμοθυμαδὸν*, ‘with one accord’ in the same duty of prayer : Acts i. 14. And secondly, *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, ‘together’, in one and the same company : ver. 15 : which therefore is there, and usually translated, ‘in one place.’ And that here, by these words the intent of the Holy Ghost is to show their meeting in one and the same assembly, is evident : for, whereas in verse 15, it is said ‘Peter stood up in the midst’ of them—as therefore, being present together in one company,—He adds, ‘the number of them that were *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, that is, ‘present together in company, were a hundred and twenty.’

“ii. Then, chap. ii. 1, another meeting of theirs for worship, at Pentecost, is continued to be expressed in the same phrases, a second time ; ‘They were all with one accord, in one place.’

“iii. Then, when [were added] ‘about three thousand,’ yet still, ver. 42, some of their meetings then, for some acts of worship, are recorded to have been as before, ‘with one accord’ ; as joining unanimously in the same duty : And instead of that former expression, *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, used of the former meetings, there is the mention of the place itself where they met set down, to supply it, and so to interpret it ; and shows, it was still in one assembly : ver. 46 ; They continued daily ‘with one accord’ in the ‘temple’ : as mentioning the very place where they had their most frequent meetings which were for hearing ; as being there, altogether, ‘in one assembly’, and not as coming thither only for Jewish worship ; for it is said of these as of the former meetings mentioned, which were proper to themselves, that ‘they continued with one accord.’ And though they held these meetings in this place for preaching, that the Jews might be present to hear, etc., yet that hindered not but it was a church-meeting to them, wherein they continued ‘with one accord :’ which expression is still used of all their Christian meetings, throughout this story : Acts i. 14 ; iv. 24 ; v. 12 ; xv. 25.

“iv. When there was a further addition to these, chap. v. 14,—whether to ‘five thousand or not, is spoken to afterwards,—yet in that chapter, he making [makes] a description of their state in almost all the very same particulars by which he had done it before, chap. ii. 43—47,—as by the parallel comparing of these two passages of the story will appear ;—He lastly, speaking of a meeting of theirs—which is the point in hand,—as carefully puts in as in the former verse, 14, ‘and they were all, with one accord, in Solomon’s porch ;’ the same words he had used chap. ii. 46 : their union, and joining together, ‘with one accord’ being carefully indigitated ; and the place named, instead of *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, as was observed before. And, that the ‘all’ that met, were not the apostles only, appears not only by the fore-mentioned parallel of this with chap. ii. 46, where their being with ‘one accord’ in the ‘temple,’ is spoken of ‘all’ the multitude, and so here ; but secondly, that ‘all’ the apostles should be met ‘with one accord’ in any duty, and not the People who are said ‘to continue’ in the apostles’ doctrine, and prayers, and *ὁμοθυμαδὸν*, or ‘with one accord’, still, in the story of this church, referring to communion in

some holy duty—as chap. i. 14, and chap. iv. 24,—is most unlikely ! And ‘Solomon’s porch’ was a place large enough to hold them, and fitted for preaching and to hear ; which in John x. 23, is called ‘the temple ;’ and so is the place intended in Acts ii. 46,—they met ‘in the temple,’ that is ‘in the porch of Solomon.’ It was ‘the outer court,’ as Josephus, lib. xx. cap. 8. : it was the place where Christ used to walk and preach, and the apostles also ; Acts iii. 11.

“v. When again, upon mention of this multiplication of disciples, the deacons are to be chosen, the apostles ‘called the multitude,’ chap. vi. 2, and not persons selected, but all ; for verse 5, they are called ‘the whole multitude ;’ and they are spoken to as together, for ‘the saying pleased the whole ;’ and the ‘whole’ chose ‘seven men’ out from among them, and set them ‘before the *apostles*,’ ver. 6, as being in one place together ; and *they* ‘prayed’—in which, ‘the multitude’ had an interest to join with them—and ‘laid, on them, hands.’ And this meeting was, certainly, a church-meeting ; and yet still in some ‘one place :’ and, therefore, though it might not fall out that, always, they should *not* have met together in one, yet they both did and could.

“vi. After the great dispersion, mentioned Acts viii. 1, then as they [that tarried there] might more conveniently meet in one place and assembly ; so, that they did so, it is carefully recorded ; that so the Holy Ghost might hold forth this from the first unto the last mention of this church, Acts xv. ; xxi. 22 ; the ‘multitude must needs come together.’ And to interpret *ὁμοθυμαδὸν*, ‘with one accord’ which the Holy Ghost carries through all, to be intended of the joining of the same persons in the same act of worship—for which they still did meet—is genuine : for it imports that which is the spirit and life of public worship ; which, of all other actions done by a ‘multitude’ is to have the nearest union of spirits, as that wherein the communion of saints, in worship, consists. And then, naming the place where they met also ; it must needs import oneness of assembly, which also holds forth, in this example, this duty, That as saints, when met in worship, should join with ‘one accord ;’ so [those] living in a place together, should, as far as possibly may, join themselves to one Assembly : and this carries with it such an appearance, as is not in the other sense. And, that the Holy Ghost should, in the ‘same story of the same church,’ set forth the unity of their first meetings as in one and the same individual assembly, by this expression of being ‘in one,’ and ‘with one accord,’ Acts ii. 1 ; and in the next mention, not far off, carry along one of the same expressions, namely, ‘with one accord,’ and together therewith shall name the place of their meeting ; and yet in the latter, intend not one, but meetings in several companies, in that place :—this we humbly submit to better judgments !

“Secondly, EXCEPTIONS :

“i. For the mention of ‘five thousand,’ Acts iv. 4. This cannot be evinced from that place, that the ‘five thousand’ were a new number added to the ‘three thousand.’ The words are these, ‘Howbeit many of them which heard the word believed ; and the number of the men *was* [*ἐγενήθη* *became*] about five thousand :’ but that this number of ‘five thousand’ should refer to them that ‘believed,’ is not certain ;

seeing both the Greek will bear it, and favour it as well to be meant of the number that heard, as of the men that believed; and of the two, that former is the more probable, that He [the Holy Ghost] should say 'of the men' that heard, they were five thousand; and that 'of them' that heard, many believed: this sounds well, and is no way forced. But five thousand 'men' to be converted at once, is that which was never afore nor since!—And the great conversion that our Divines have instanced in, is the 'three thousand,' chap. ii. 41, and not this 'five thousand.'—And if the scope of the Holy Ghost therein, Why the number of the men that 'heard' should be here reckoned to be 'five thousand'? be asked after; it was to show what had occasioned the persecution which He had spoken of in the verse before: namely this, That such a multitude of 'the people' should be 'taught' and 'preached to;' this fretted the Pharisees [Sadducees] that 'came upon' Peter and John. And with this agrees the second verse, that they were 'grieved, they taught the people:' the effect whereof is, that 'many of them which heard believed,' notwithstanding this persecution; but how many of these, is not certain. And Beza and Calvin and many others of our Protestant writers judge this number, not to be of this new accession of converts, but the total number, including the former.—Beza, in 1 Cor. i. 13; Steph., Budæus, Eustath.—And the ἀνδρῶν, although translated 'men,' is, when put alone, as there, all one with ἀνθρώπων, females as well as males, which especially may be so taken because it is spoken of such a promiscuous auditory. And if any should affirm it meant of males only, and them now converted, it would make a greater miracle than any other recorded; especially when 'the people,' ver. 21, are said to be converted, that did alike run to see the miracle.

" ii. It may be supposed that all, that are mentioned to be converted, remained not *constant* members of that church abiding at Jerusalem until the dispersion; and so, though the Holy Ghost's scope may be to show the increase of converts to the faith, yet not of such as continued all that while at Jerusalem: and our reasons for that, are these: i. Those 'three thousand' who were converted chap. ii. 41, were not settled dwellers at Jerusalem, but 'strangers,' commorants of the ten tribes which were dispersed in all those countries mentioned in verse 9, etc., who came up to the feast of Pentecost;—as the manner of the Jews was: Acts xxi. 20, 27, 28. Jews that lived in 'Asia' came to the feast of Pentecost; as Paul also did, compared with Acts xx. 16. And the word which is translated 'dwellers' [dwelling] at Jerusalem, chap. ii. 5, is interpreted by an eminent critic 'sojourners' at Jerusalem during this feast,—although the word signifies both; and to that end he—Mede, Diatribe—quotes the Septuagint in 1 Kings xvii. 20, where Elijah cries unto the Lord, saying, 'O Lord my God, hast thou also brought evil upon the widow—μεθ' ἧς ἐγὼ κατοικῶ—with whom I sojourn?' and that which confirms it is, that they are said to be 'dwellers,' or inhabitants 'of [in] Mesopotamia and Judea,' etc., Acts ii. 9. They could not fixedly belong, as dwellers, to both: they were, therefore, rather 'sojourners' in Jerusalem now, at the feast, though fixed dwellers in all those [other] places. For if they were

fixed 'dwellers' in Jerusalem, to what end, whilst they were at Jerusalem should the evangelist tell us they were sojourners 'in Mesopotamia?' And they must needs rather be 'dwellers' there, because they are said to understand every one 'his own language.' And that which strengthens this is, that, in the Greek, there is this difference in the words in verses 5 and 9, in that they are said κατοικεῖν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ 'in Jerusalem;' as for the present, there; yea, and as to come ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους 'from out of every nation:' but in verse 9 he changeth it, and says κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν 'inhabiters of Mesopotamia,' and those other countries where their fixed possessions were. And therefore, verse 14, he calls them 'men, Jews, and dwellers at Jerusalem;' as two sorts: and verse 22, 'men of Israel,' the style given those of the ten tribes scattered; men 'devout,' as verse 5, who came up at those solemn times, having wives and children, and their families, at home, to whom they used after a time to return. Now, although these were 'added' and made members of that church, and are said to continue 'in the apostles' doctrine,' verses 41, 42; yet that will not, necessarily, imply that they 'continued' all the time till the dispersion, at Jerusalem; but, whilst they were there, they were προσκαρτεροῦντες, that is, they cleaved to the apostles. But to think of many of them coming as 'strangers,' should not go down to their wives and children which nature taught them to provide for, and religion taught them to take care of their souls; or to fetch them up to them; [cannot be.] So as [consequently,] this might well be a fluid church, ebbing and flowing, as touching the residence of its members: yea, [that] some of these were of 'Judea,' verse 9, and so of the country round about; and of them, might be churches erected in their proper dwellings; is rationally supposable. For in that 'persecution,' Acts viii. 1, it is said that Paul persecuted disciples in other places than at Jerusalem, 'which thing I also did at Jerusalem,' says he, chap. xxvi. 10; and in other places, at Damascus, verses 11, 12. And also it is confirmed by this, that upon the ceasing of Paul's persecution, it is said, chap. ix. 31, 'Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee;' and are said to be 'at rest,' in distinction from the 'persecution' raised, chap. viii. 1.

"iii. They, in those countries and times, had often great assemblies, consisting of many thousand hearers at once that did and could hear: Luke xii. 1, Christ preached to 'myriads;' and Acts xiii. 44, 'almost' a 'whole city' came 'to hear the Word of God' by Paul. And at Charenton, how many thousands may and do hear, is well known; and so in many places of England. And Moses sometimes spake in the ears of all the people [Deut. xxxii. 44, 45.]; and so Ezra x. 9, 10. And it is known by experience that as in hot countries they may see as far again, through the pureness of the air, so they may hear at a far greater distance than in our colder climate.

"iv. This being the first Church, and whereof all the apostles were the officers; those therefore, that dwelt there would, certainly, abide together as one church, without parting or dividing, even till they came to the utmost proportion that the constitution of a church was capable of; and so maximum quod sic: and continue together in one, for the

more united strength and glory of holding forth the name of Christ; in one body, united for the honour of religion, and communicating in ordinances together.

“v. They had, during all this time of their multitudes until the persecution of Paul arose, the greatest freedom and liberty, even to the uttermost; for ‘the people’ magnified them, Acts v. 13; they had ‘favour with all the people,’ ii. 47; insomuch that although the rulers fell upon two of them, John and Peter, yet they were enforced to ‘let them go, . . . because of the people,’ iv. 21. Besides that, it was no new thing amongst the Jews for sects to have great multitudes to follow and cleave to them, and to preach in any place—as in Spain and Italy—and to baptize openly, as John and Christ did [John iii. 23, 26].”^a

“REASONS and ANSWERS to the Appendix added to the former Proof: Namely,

“‘That the dispersion mentioned in Acts viii. 1, doth not simply prove such a scattering as that there might not remain more Congregations than one in that Church: Acts ix. 31; xii. 24; xxi. 20.’”

“Thus having showed the ‘multitudes’ not arising to that number but that they might meet in one: now, after the dispersion, much less! And to that end let the greatness of the persecution be considered to demonstrate the greatness of this dispersion. It is called not a persecution only, but ‘a great persecution,’ Acts xiii. 1; both extensively and intensively. For the extent of it; to all sorts of persons; ‘entering into every house,’ verse 3: and for the height of it; it being to imprisonment, even unto ‘death,’ xxii. 4; xxvi. 10. It is also called a making ‘havoc of the church,’ viii. 3. The object of this ‘persecution’ was not preachers only, but Christians of all sorts indifferently; for it is said indefinitely, to be upon ‘the church,’ verses 1, 3. It is called an ‘entering into every house, haling men and women,’ verse 3: and chap. xxvi., Paul, speaking of this very ‘persecution,’ says, verse 10, that he imprisoned ‘many of the saints;’ not preachers only; and verse 9, his aim was promiscuously against ‘the Name’ of Jesus, and so any that professed his ‘Name.’ Unto this end, compare the varying expression used, by the Holy Ghost, when speaking of this persecution and of another mentioned chap. xii. 1: there it is said, Herod stretched forth his hands to vex ‘certain of the church;’ but here chap. viii. it is ‘against the church in Jerusalem;’ men and women, ‘in every house.’ And ‘all, except the apostles,’—the word *πλὴν*, ‘except,’ there, is to show that none of the apostles ‘were scattered,’ though the generality of others were. If gifted men fled away, then others also; except we suppose the people more courageous to stay by it, than the teachers! And whereas it is said that these that were dispersed, ‘went about, preaching the Word,’ verse 4: first, it argueth not that preachers only or chiefly were dispersed; for, as Calvin saith, It comes in, to show what was the ‘fruit’ of the dispersion: and we may well suppose women and whole families to have been ‘scattered abroad,’ who yet preached not. And, secondly, it

^a P. 13—18.

was ordinary, in those times, for men that were not by office, ministers, occasionally to teach the Word in private ways of converse, yea and otherwise. And that is not called teaching, only, which is by way of sermon to a multitude; for verse 35 of this eighth chapter, Philip, in private, taught the Eunuch; as Aquila and Priscilla taught Apollos, chap. xviii. 26. And they are not called *εὐαγγελισταὶ* as having an office; but *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι*, as referring to an act, the work they did: and the word seems to sound as if they made it their work. It may well be attributed to the zeal of those days, to gain proselytes; and not to an office, committed to them: they went not forth by mission, but ‘persecution.’ And here, the ‘many congregations’ are brought but to an—it might be; and the grand ‘[third] Proposition’ itself, is but an it ‘may be’: and how can it ‘may be’ be proved by an ‘it might be?’ Especially in such things as need have a strong foundation for matters upon which so great alterations are like to be made!

“But it is said, That it appears there were multitudes of believers there after that time, ‘by Acts ix. 31; xii. 24; xxi. 20.’ First, for Acts ix. 31; *ἐπληθύνοντο*, signifies not, ordinarily, a great number made up, but an increase,—Matt. xxi. 11; 1 Pet. i. 2, ‘grace..be multiplied;’ it is the same word,—not in number but in measure. Again, they are the churches of ‘Judea, Galilee, and Samaria:’ but what is all this, to prove that there were so many in ‘the church of Jerusalem’ as could not meet in ‘one’ [place]? For Acts xxi. 20; *πόσας μυριάδες*, ‘how many thousands,’ doth not argue it: for first, it was the feast of Pentecost. When Paul came now up to Jerusalem, in Acts xx. 16, it is said of this journey, that he ‘hasted, if possible to be at Jerusalem upon the day of Pentecost,’ when the Jews out of all quarters came to Jerusalem; and the great concourse that then would be there at the feast, moved him to be there at that time. And by the journal of Paul thither, from his first setting out from Philippi, chap. xx. 6, which was when the Passover was ended,—eight weeks before this ensuing feast of Pentecost;—and also by computing the days of his travelling, which the Holy Ghost hath recorded verses [14—] 16; chap. xxi. 3, it appears he came, in a few weeks into Tyre—but forty miles off from Jerusalem—time enough to come to the feast; and no wonder if, at the feast, he found ‘thousands’ of the Jews! And this is confirmed by verse 27; for the Jews which laid hold on him ‘in the temple’ were, as it is said, Jews ‘of Asia’, not of Judea. Secondly, the word *μυριάς* being put without any other word of number, signifies no more than a great multitude, as *μύριον πλήθος*; or a greatness, as *ἐν μυρία πενια*, as Plato hath it; and being put indefinitely, is all one [as] to say ‘thousands’ or ‘many:’ as the Latins also use a definite for an indefinite, as, *Sexcenta possum proferre decreta*, as Tully speaks.”

[“ANSWERS] to the Second Proof of the First Head.

“By the many apostles and other preachers in this church of Jerusalem: for if there were but one congregation there, then each apostle preached but seldom; which will not stand with Acts vi. 2.”

“First: For the apostles. They took all opportunities to fill their

hands with work ; preaching ' daily in the temple, and in every house : ' Acts v. 42 ; ii. 46. Paul also ' taught ' in Ephesus, as ' publicly ' in the congregation, so ' from house to house : ' chap. xx. 20. Also, when any, in the places abroad, in Judea or elsewhere, were converted—and many churches were then erected in Judea,—the apostles went abroad, as chap. viii. shows ; and besides, how were the twelve employed when for ' forty days, ' they went in ' an upper room ' and had but ' a hundred and twenty ' for their flock ? Acts i.

" Secondly: For the many Teachers. In those times there were many gifted men that were not officers, who occasionally instructed others, as Aquilla did Apollos. Yea, those gifts were so plentiful that in that one church of Corinth, almost all of them had doctrines, prophesying, speaking with tongues, and yet these were not officers : 1 Cor. xiv. 23. So as, if congregations should be multiplied according to the number of such gifted men, then there would have been almost as many teachers as members of congregations ! And the pouring out of the Holy Ghost, which was more ordinary then, did not make every man a teacher by office, for then all those in ' Samaria ' should have been made teachers : Acts viii. And that not any of these were in office, seems evident by this, That when the ' deacons ' were chosen, chap. vi., there is no mention made of elders in their ordination ; in which, if any elders had been, they had had an interest.—We read chap xv., when there were elders, though apostles were also then in that church, both are mentioned together.—And it appears the apostles had managed all the affairs of that church until then : those ' deacons ' being the first choice of any sort of officers ; the work of administration of all sorts having lain on the apostles' hands.

[" ANSWERS] to the Third Proof of the First Head.

" ' The diversity of languages amongst the believers, Acts ii. 8—11, and chap. vi., doth argue more congregations than one, in the church of Jerusalem. ' "

" First: It is true there were, in that 2nd of Acts, ' out of all nations ' that heard the apostles speak in the several languages of the countries they were born in ; but yet these were all either Jews or proselytes—*ἐν λαβείς*, worshippers, as verse 5—who came up to worship, and some parts of the worship were audible ; and though born in other countries,—the Jews being dispersed,—yet all were generally learned, and understood the Hebrew tongue, the language of their own nation, even as to this day the Jews and their children do : which seems evident from the story of the Acts. Paul came up with divers Grecians to the feast of Pentecost, xx. 4, unto which the Jews out of all quarters came ; being all at a solemn meeting ' in the temple, ' xxi. 27, the Jews ' out of Asia, ' strangers, ' stirred up all the people ' against him ; and when he made a speech to them, and they ' heard he spake in the Hebrew tongue ', xxii. 2, they kept ' silence ' and heard him patiently. And further, those mentioned chap. ii, did understand, all of them, Peter's sermon ; and though others spake, besides Peter, to them in their own language ' the wonderful things of God, ' verse 11, yet that was but a preparatory ' sign ' to them, as 1 Cor. xiv. 22, making way for their conversion : Acts ii. 11—13. But the means of their con-

version was Peter's sermon after; and it was he, also, that gave direction to them 'all' what to do to be saved, and therefore it must be spoken in some one common tongue they 'all' understood. And those gifts of languages given to the apostles were not out of a necessity to instruct these new converts only, but to fit them when they should go abroad into all the world, and to be 'a sign' to the Jews at present, to convince them.

"Secondly: For the Grecian Widows, Acts vi. 1. The Hellenists that lived amongst the Jews, might well be supposed to understand Hebrew; and that these had not several [separate] congregations from the rest, appears by this, That 'the whole multitude' together met and 'chose' the deacons: it was a joint act. And if of differing languages wherein the one understood not the other; occasioning such a distinction of 'congregations,' as the Proof would hold forth; how could they 'all' have agreed, in one meeting, on the same man [men]? But the Argument as well holds against the Presbyterial association of those congregations into one church—people and elders—unto which, and in the communion and exercise whereof, such correspondencies and intercourses are needful, as they require one common language!"

["ANSWER] to the Second Branch of this Argument.

"'That all these congregations were under one presbyterial government.'

"First Proof: Because 'They were one church.' Though it be 'one,' yet they not being more than could meet in one [place], the argument concludes not.

"Second Proof: 'The elders of that church are mentioned.' There is no mention of any 'elders' in this church until after the aforesaid dispersion, Acts viii.; and so the weight of this argument will depend upon the proof of this, That after the dispersion, there were many congregations: which the Reverend Assembly doth not so positively affirm. The proof of their being such a 'presbytery' as the Proposition intends, doth depend upon this, Their being called—elders to that church: we nowhere read them called a Presbytery, and that, therefore, they are elders; but, they are therefore a Presbytery, as is here argued, because they are—elders to that church! Now, if they be elders, in common, because a presbytery,—as was said in our first argument,—then, they are not to be argued a presbytery only; because they are elders in common: for, then, the argument runs *in circulo*. And the chief and first reason of their being elders—for no other is mentioned—is, accordingly, held forth in their being elders to that church, in common; whereas according to Presbyterial principles, there is a primary relation of elders, quâ elders, to their particular fixed congregations."

"REASONS against the Third Proof of the Second Branch; namely,

"'That the apostles did the ordinary acts of presbyters, as presbyters in the church of Jerusalem, doth prove a presbyterial government in that church, before the dispersion.'

"The proof of the whole, depends upon this proposition; for though before the dispersion, there had been many congregations, yet not under elders, but apostles. Now it is granted, that the substance of

ministerial acts was one and the same in apostles and evangelists who were extraordinary, and in other ordinary, ministers. But, first: though, for the act of ministerial power, it was the same in the apostles and them; yet in the extent of power,—which is the point in question,—therein, the apostles' jurisdiction over many congregations, is not the pattern of presbyterial elders over many. For the apostles' power was universal, over all churches; and upon that was founded their power over those congregations supposed many! And Episcopacy may as well argue and infer, That because in Crete—by apostolical warrant—one man, Titus, did 'ordain elders,' etc.; that therefore, there may be one man, a Bishop, that hath power to ordain, etc., in and over several churches. And this argument will be stronger from the instance of an evangelist, for Episcopal power; than this, of apostolical government, for the Presbyterial, by how much it is the more inferior office: but that of the apostles' is more immediate and transcendent; and so the power of an evangelist, is nearer to an ordinary succession. And it will as well follow, that any one presbyter alone might govern many congregations, because one of these apostles might; as that, because the apostles did govern these jointly, that therefore many presbyters over several [separate] congregations may.

“Secondly: Each of these apostles, as he had, by virtue of his apostolical commission, the power of them all; so he had relation of ministry unto all these supposed congregations—unto every person thereof—for the performance of all sorts of duties; of preaching to them, admonishing them, etc. But thus in the Presbyterial Government over many congregations fixed and their pastors and elders fixed to them, the several elders are denied to have the relation of elders to each congregation, but make up only an eldership, in common, as united over all these. But the apostles here have the relation to both: and therefore, if this apostolical frame be made a pattern; then it follows, that all the elders of these congregations were directly and immediately elders to each congregation and every member of them, and not only of a common presbytery; for so the apostles were!

“If it be alleged, That those acts of government performed by them in that church were, for the substance of them, ordinary acts, such as presbyters perform; and that therefore, answerably, their persons themselves are, in them, to be considered as elders, because that the apostles were not only apostles but elders also,—as 2 John 1; 1 Peter v. 1,—and therefore might and did act as elders in ordinary acts of church-government, and are, therefore, therein to be looked at as a just pattern to us, and to have ruled these congregations of Jerusalem as a college or body of elders united: condescending so to act, as common presbyters taking the consent of the church—as Acts vi;—as likewise they did in every church where they came; joining with the eldership thereof, as elders and not as apostles; and therefore, that they might give a pattern and example of an ordinary presbytery; especially seeing that what they thus did, they did as a united body to many congregations considered as one church:—

“It is answered to the First: That although the apostles are called elders, yet they are so virtually, not formally, and but because apostle-

ship contains all offices in it: so as, they are elders but upon this ground that they are apostles. And therefore John, in that very epistle where he styles himself an 'elder,' he yet writes canonical Scripture as an apostle; and takes on him to threaten Diotrephes, as an apostle, to remember him, 3rd Ep. 9, 10, which, as a formal elder, he could not have done. And surely, those officers which Christ distinguisheth, 'He gave some, apostles; . . . some, pastors and teachers,' Eph. iv. 11; the same person is not formally both, though virtually he may be. All that they did, in that church of Jerusalem, they are said to act as apostles: their preaching is called 'the apostles' doctrine,' Acts ii. 42; their bringing their monies to them as to the officers of that church, is to them not as elders but as apostles, they laid it down 'at the apostles' feet,' chap. iv. 37; yea, in that act of ordaining the seven deacons, it is said they set them 'afore the apostles,' and 'they laid on their hands,' vi. 6. And it is very hard to distinguish and say, that the men were apostles, but the power they acted by was as elders, when the name of 'an apostle' imports the office. Yea, in that very act of government about deacons, they must needs act as apostles; for they do not simply ordain the men, but do, anew by virtue of apostolical authority, institute the office of deacons by declaring Christ's mind; which none but apostles could immediately and at first have done: so as, the same persons in this same act instanced in, must act partly as apostles and partly as elders; and by what infallible rule, shall we distinguish?

"To the Second, namely, That they acted here, as it were, in a joint body, or *in collegio*, over those many congregations: it is answered, That an association of elders, in an eldership over many, is not argued from hence. For first; they had all singly, the same power which they exercised jointly; and that they should exercise it jointly here, to that end, To give a pattern for eldership,—is not easy to prove. They exercised it together because it fell out that they were together, and it was fit none of them should be excluded; but it depended not upon this union of all in a body, as acts of elders in a presbytery do. As parliamentary power is not the result of parliament men, but as assembled in parliament; yea, and the authority of jurisdiction thence ariseth: not so here; one apostle might have done that which all here did. Yea, may it not be said that because two apostles, Paul and Barnabas, 'ordained elders in every church,' Acts xiv. 23, as joined in the same act, and so acting not as apostles but jointly, that therefore two elders, associated, may do the like? Secondly; it is hard to suppose that these apostles when all together, should act with an inferior power to what they put forth in a like case alone. If Peter had been himself alone in a church new-planted, then and there he must be supposed to act as an apostle; because he alone governed: and shall these apostles, when they are all in one, and join all together in one act, be yet supposed to fall lower in their power, under the formal exercise of it? Thirdly; if they had acted as elders in a college, they might miscarry as elders do; and so the minor part of them have been subject to excommunication of [by] the greater. And what power was there, on earth, to have excommunicated an apostle, who

held his office immediately from Christ; and who, whilst he was in that office, had power over all churches?

“To the Third, namely, That they, in their proceedings, did join with others: as in this choice of the deacons they did join with the multitude; as also, when they came to any other churches, they used to do. Neither doth that argue that they acted not as apostles, but as elders: for, first; they joined in acts with others, and joined others with themselves, wherein they yet acted as apostles: thus in writing Scripture, they joined others with them, as Paul joined Silvanus and Timotheus, in his epistles to the Thessalonians; and not merely in the salutations, for the expressions run in their names also in [throughout] those epistles. And Acts xv., the apostles, elders, yea, and brethren, joined in a Letter to the churches; but these, as apostles—therefore so called, in distinction from the elders,—and the rest according to their several interests: as the ‘brethren’ did all according to their interests, so the ‘elders’ and the ‘apostles’ in theirs. So, in ordaining Timothy, the ‘presbytery’ laid on hands, yet they as a presbytery, and Paul as an apostle, 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; for, else, a presbytery had not had power to ordain an evangelist. Yet, secondly; the apostles did, wherever they came, leave the elders and people to the exercise of that right which belonged to them, although they joined with them: neither did therein, lie their apostolical authority to do all, alone; for then they seldom or never acted as apostles, in churches. Paul alone, excommunicated not that Corinthian, and yet as an apostle wrote to have it done by them—for it was canonical Scripture;—and therefore, although that this church of Jerusalem should choose their deacons, is a just example of the privilege of a church—for, if the apostles when they were present, allowed this interest to churches, then elders should much more!—yet, what the apostles did by an apostolical power, in these congregations, cannot be drawn into example for officers, in that thing wherein their power-apostolical lay; which was, to exercise acts of jurisdiction in several churches.

“Neither, Fourthly, will that help it, That they exercised this government in these congregations—supposed many—as considered to be one church. For if they acted not as ‘elders,’ then the correlate to it, namely, ‘church,’ could not be considered as Presbyterial!”

“REASONS against the Fourth and last Proof of the Second Branch; namely,

“‘That the elders did meet together, for acts of government, Acts xi. 30; xv. 4, 6, 22; xxi. 17, 18.’

“First: The argument from Acts xi. 30, lies thus, There were elders in Judea, that received alms—verses 29, 30, compared;—therefore, the elders of Jerusalem did meet together of [for] acts of government. In this argument as the persons are mistaken, so the act: for the elders of Jerusalem are not mentioned, but of ‘Judea,’ as by comparing the verses 29, 30, it appears. And by this, it might be as well argued, That the elders in Judea met for presbyterial government; as that the elders of Jerusalem [did]; seeing their alms were carried to the elders of Judea, as it is there said. The receiving alms, which is

the only act that is mentioned, was not an act of government; for deacons may meet to receive alms, and yet meet not for acts of government. For that second place mentioned, chap. xxi. 18, where it is said, Paul came to James, 'and all the elders were present;' although we read that all the elders 'were present,' yet that they met for acts of presbyterial government, appears not. The occasion of the meeting was Paul's entertainment, whom some of the 'brethren' had received at his first coming, verse 17; and now 'the elders' meet to receive him also: a christian duty of love and respect, due to so great and famous an apostle. And Paul went not as cited [thither], but to visit and salute them, as verse 19. Secondly, the acts that passed, were none of them presbyterial: for Paul gave them a historical relation of 'what things God had wrought by his ministry;' the matter of which relation, was intended to provoke them, as brethren and fellow-labourers, to glorify God, as, verse 20, it is said they did; and not to give them an account, as to a consistory that met for government. Such narrations, the apostles made even to whole churches; as Paul and Barnabas, at Antioch, 'when they had gathered the—whole—church together,' chap. xiv. 27,—which 'church' was of no more than to meet in one assembly—'they rehearsed,' in like manner as here, 'all that God had done by [with] them;' and how he had opened a 'door of faith to the Gentiles.' Neither will the advice they gave to Paul, to prevent the scandal and offence the people would take at him, argue authority, much less government: neither was there any act of government put forth over their own churches, if supposed many!"^a

"REASONS against the alleging Acts xv. for the meeting of the elders of Jerusalem—For Presbyterial acts of Government.

"i. If it were 'a meeting of elders, for acts of government;' then it was a presbyterial meeting for acts of government: but that it was no such meeting appears, because there was nothing done in it that may seem to have any bond in it but such as bound the churches of Antioch, Syria, Cilicia, as much as Jerusalem; but this cannot be by any presbyterial meeting, for acts of government; for such meetings have only authoritative power over their own church.

"ii. The scope and end of this meeting was [were], to give satisfaction to the offended brethren of Antioch, and dogmatically to declare their judgments in a difficult case of conscience; not to put forth any act of judicial power upon any, as appears in the matter of their debate and the issue of all: of which, more fully afterward. And if it be said, that Peter reprov'd some of their own members present; such as had taught the necessity of the ceremonial law, 'Why tempt ye God, etc.,' Acts xv. 10, this was not delivered as an act of government, formally, by any vote of the presbytery, but in the way of discourse.

"But it was affirmed to be sufficient to confirm the Proposition, if it be 'a synodical meeting.' Presbyterial and Synodical, both, it cannot be: for synods, they are—or ought to be—extraordinary and occasional; presbyteries, are standing and ordinary. Synods are made up of commissioners sent from presbyteries; and presbyteries are made up of the elders of particular congregations. The members of synods,

^a P. 18—27.

are elders of such churches which are—according to the principles of presbyterial government—complete churches, having full power of jurisdiction for all acts of government within themselves; but the members of presbyteries, are elders of such congregations which are neither complete churches, nor have, within themselves, full and complete power—and these cannot be one. The elders of the presbytery at Jerusalem—when this, once became a synod, by the addition of the elders of other churches,—ceased to be any longer a presbytery to that church, and must [have] become, with them, a new body to all the churches these other elders did come from. And then to argue these acts done by these—because the elders of Jerusalem were present, and members of this synod,—were presbyterial acts of the elders of Jerusalem; is all one as to go about to argue from the acts of government put forth by a Parliament at Westminster to the power of the burgesses and common-council of the city of Westminster, because there the Parliament sits, and the burgesses of that city are parts and members of that Parliament: or, as if all the kingdom were governed by county-courts, and out of those county-courts knights and burgesses should be chosen to make up a Parliament when the Parliament is met; there can be no argument drawn from the power of a Parliament, to prove the power of a county-court; or from the power of a county-court, to prove the power of a Parliament. Thus, Synods are made out of Presbyteries; therefore we cannot argue from the power of Presbyteries to the power of Synods! But, secondly, we deny it to have been such an ordinary, formal synod. The jurisdiction of synods, is founded upon this necessary requisite thereunto, That there be commissioners, from all those churches, representing them, present, or called [summoned] to be so: and the power of the jurisdiction cannot reach nor extend further than to such churches as have sent commissioners thereunto. The weight, then, of this synodical power, depends on the proof of this, That all those churches sent commissioners to this assembly: which if either it be not proved or the contrary thereunto found true, the authority of those ‘decrees,’ as from those elders here, will prove not to have been ‘acts of government’ further than the apostles’ authority also joined in it was stamped upon it. To affirm, that commissioners from them all were present, because the decrees did bind them; is to beg what is denied, when another, just, reason may be given of their binding, if any such authority were in them. And our Reasons to the contrary, are these:

“First: We find a deep silence about it. For we read but only of two churches between whom it was transacted; they of Antioch, sending to Jerusalem and their elders there,—xiv. 27, 28, compared with xv. 2—4,—and the messengers which were sent from this assembly going only to Antioch, verses 30, 31, as those who were chiefly troubled; only the benefit, redounded to all they wrote to. Yea, although Paul came [had come] through Phenice and Samaria, verse 3, yet we read not a word of any of the churches of those parts, their sending of any commissioners unto this synod, as, had it been intended such, certainly they would. And there was this special reason, why those of this church [of Jerusalem] were thus electively sent unto; because they

were the mother church from whom the Word of God came, and from whom those men that 'troubled' them had gone forth, and had pretended to teach what they had received from them; and besides, they were in an especial manner, versed in this question, it being about the observation of their law; and there also, some of the apostles were present,—how many, we know not; for dispersed they had been, long before;—and if any member of others, out of those other parts of Judea, had come up hither, it would have been said as chap. xi. 29, 30, 'the elders' of Judea, not only of Jerusalem; yea, it is not so much as said, they that were sent from Antioch were 'the elders' of that church, but that they sent 'Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of them,' xv. 2.

"And, secondly: The contrary seems clear; namely, That those 'letters' and 'decrees' were written and sent only from the elders of 'Jerusalem,' and not from all those churches. For first; the 'decrees' are everywhere attributed to the elders in 'Jerusalem:' so chap. xvi. 4, 'the decrees . . . of the apostles and elders *in* Jerusalem,' *πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ*. Now the usual style of the New Testament is, by way of distinction of churches, to say the church 'in' such a place; the elders 'in' such a place; as the church *of*—*ἐν*—Antioch, xiii. 1, and the church *at*—*ἐν*—Corinth, 1 Cor. i. 2; and by the like reason, the elders 'in' such a place, do signify the proper elders of the church 'in' that place or city whilst but one; and, therefore, if by the elders 'in' Jerusalem, had been meant [that] in this place only the elders met, from all quarters at Jerusalem, as the place of that assembly, there had been a great ambiguity; seeing, the more usual and proper import of that expression is to note out the fixed, standing elders of a place, and the church in a place! Again, secondly; in Acts xv. 4, Paul and Barnabas are said to be 'received of the church, and apostles and elders,' namely, of 'Jerusalem,' as in particular relation to it. Yea, thirdly; the standing elders of that place assumed to themselves to have written the decrees; 'As touching the Gentiles . . . *we* have written and concluded,' xxi. 25. Fourthly; and, accordingly, the conclusion [resolution] of their letter is made the special act of that church and the elders thereof, 'It pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church,' chap. xv. 22,—that is, as verse 4, of Jerusalem—'to send chosen men;' and the letter runs thus, 'The apostles and elders and brethren:' verse 23. Fifthly; the matter of the letter argues it; 'Forasmuch as . . . certain that went out from *us* have troubled you with words; . . . to whom we gave no such commandment,' verse 24: how could this be said by a synod of the elders of those churches which were themselves 'troubled' by them? It is manifest therefore, they came out from this church, of Jerusalem, who wrote this; and they pretended 'the apostles' doctrine,' which is called a commandment, because the apostles taught no other than what Christ 'commanded,' as Matt. xxviii. 20. And to say, the denomination was from the more eminent part, namely, the elders of that church; had been derogatory to the synod, if it had been such a meeting. And, sixthly; if the elders of all those churches had been present, there had been less need for 'the apostles and elders' of Jerusalem to have sent 'chosen men

to carry the letters, and withal to show the grounds of those their judgments by word of mouth; xv. 23, 27, 31, This needed not, if their own elders had been present, and so had been to have returned: and if they were sent as messengers from the synod, then to all the churches as well as to Antioch; and why do they then go no further than unto Antioch? verse 33. Yea, and although Paul and Barnabas 'delivered' those results to all the cities, yet as it should seem accidentally, and not principally, intended; they go not on purpose chiefly to deliver those decrees, but, chap. xv. 36, it was Paul's motion, upon other grounds, to go [and] visit the churches 'in every city' where they had 'preached;' and so, but occasionally delivered these 'decrees;' xvi. 4: so as, they came to them not as 'sent' in a mandatory way as to churches subject to that synod by a synodical law—as such canons are used to be sent,—but as the judgment only of this church; and the apostles 'delivered them,' for their edification.

"And, in the third place: If there were any further authority, or jurisdiction, in their 'decrees,' it was from the apostles who were present and concurred in it, and who had power over all the churches. And accordingly, though the elders in the whole church were present and joined with the apostles, quantum in se, to consent and approve their decrees with that several respective kind of judgment proper unto them, yet all the authority put forth over these churches was that transcendent authority of the apostles; which is not now left in all the elders of the world joined together: and that [accordingly] therefore, these 'decrees' made and the decision of these questions here, were by apostolical authority! And to that end, they subjoined that apostolical seal, 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.' And although the ordinary 'elders,' yea and 'the whole church,' joined in this, yet but according to their measure, analogy and proportion of their faith;—even as in writing some epistles, Timothy and Silvanus joined with Paul, but yet Paul only wrote apostolically, and the authority in them is looked at as his;—or else because, perhaps, they having the Holy Ghost fallen on them through 'the apostles' doctrine' then delivered,—which was then usual,—persuading their hearts unanimously—though afore, dissenting—to 'accord,' as verse 25; in that respect, they might speak this in such a sense that no assembly of men, wanting apostolical presence and instruction, may now speak. And, although it may be objected, that, then, this letter and these decrees should be formal Scripture, and so bind us still; it is answered, that they are Scripture, and written for our learning; and, if the case were the same upon which they obliged them then, namely, matter of offence, that then, they would bind us now; but the things being enjoined but as ἐπ'ἀνάγκης, things of a superadded casual necessity, and not absolute; in case of offence only, and not simply for the things themselves; therefore, now, the necessity being ceased, the obligation ceaseth: yet so as the equity of the rule and ground these were commanded upon, to 'abstain' from things that offend our brethren, doth hold, in like cases, to the end of the world.

"And [fourthly,] last of all: There is no act of such authority and government put forth in it, which the Proposition intendeth: which

will appear if we either consider the occasion and rise of it, or the issue and result of it.

“ [First,] It was not a set stated meeting, by common agreement of the churches; but Antioch sends to Jerusalem unknown to them. There are no summonses sent to send up delinquents, nor can we find these disturbers are sent to Jerusalem to be censured by those ecclesiastical punishments in which government doth properly lie and consist. The subject matter sent to them, for their decision, was merely matter of doctrine, ‘about this question,’ xv. 2, and about this word, namely, whether the ceremonial ‘law,’ verse 5, was to be observed? Concerning which, they wrote their judgments dogmatically; which they were called to do, being thus sent unto. Neither doth it argue, that it was more than to determine this question doctrinally, they came up for; because that Paul and Barnabas could have decided that before,—being themselves apostles,—and that, therefore, their coming up was for discipline against delinquents: for, as the case stood, they listened not to Paul and Barnabas as apostles, but pretended the judgment of the other apostles. For indeed Paul and Barnabas did declare their judgments—the *εἰσόδος*, or contention, verse 2, being attributed unto them as contending against the false teachers, for the truth,—and so as even the church of Antioch rested not in their decision: otherwise, Paul and Barnabas might have, as apostles, censured those delinquents, without coming to Jerusalem; as well as, by apostolic authority, have decided the question; for apostolic power extended to discipline as well as doctrine. If it be said, That even doctrinally to deliver the truth, when it is done by a company of elders, hath authority or power in it; as when Christ said, ‘Go, and teach; all power is given me,’ Matt. xxviii. 20, 19: it is granted, an authority exercised in doctrine, and so to be in synods; but yet not jurisdiction, which the Proposition intends; which is, when doctrines are delivered, sub pœna, under the penalty of that ecclesiastical punishment of excommunication, if not received. One minister, alone, hath a dogmatical authority, as a minister, to rebuke, exhort; and yet acts of jurisdiction are not his alone, but of others conjoined with him.

“ Neither, secondly, do the titles given to these results of theirs, argue a jurisdiction, in that they are called *τὰ δόγματα* and *τὰ κεκριμένα*, Acts xvi. 4. For although the word *δόγμα* is used for an Imperial decree, Luke ii. 1, yet but rarely; and more commonly, as Stephanus and Budæus observe, for doctrine and opinion in matters moral or speculative, as ‘Platonis dogma,’ etc.; and thence is translated to import ‘the judgments of divines given in matters theological,’ although delivered with certainty. And so, the using of this word, implieth the subject to have been doctrinal only, and so delivered. And further, the subject matter of this decision being about rules and ceremonies and the non-observation of them, the [term] *δόγμα* is elegantly and, perhaps, on purpose given to these apostolical canons, by way of opposition and contradiction, to those that taught and observed such rules, who are said *δογματίζειν* in so doing, Col. ii. 20; being led away by the false *δόγματα*, or heterodox theses, of false teachers that enjoined them. And for that other word, *κεκριμένα*, translated ‘ordained,’ i

plainly notes out but this, that these doctrinal *theses* were the joint, declared, and avowed judgment and conclusions of these—and so, answereth to those other words in their letters, ‘It seemed good unto us, being . . . with one accord,’ etc. Acts xv. 25.—apostles and elders thus met, with ‘one accord’ agreeing therein, and particularly and unanimously so judging; and therefore when James gives his judgment, he useth the same word κρίνω, verse 19, ‘this is my *judgment*,’ which being voted and agreed upon by the rest they are called κερριμένα. Neither doth this argue any act of authority, that the things here declared to be observed are indifferent, for some of them come under a moral consideration, and all come under the case of offence.

“Neither [thirdly], doth the language they commend these [letters] to them in, sound of that jurisdiction, or government, intended in the Proposition. For although they seem to speak as guided infallibly in their resolution,—‘It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us,’—yet their expressions are carried so as to avoid jurisdiction. Those words, ‘to lay no other [πλέον] burden,’ if any, must import this jurisdiction; but these words, as Ludovicus de Dieu hath well observed are, as they may be, taken passively, therein agreeing with the Syriac translation, ‘It seemeth good, . . . that no other burden *be laid* on you:’ that whereas these teachers of the circumcision had gone about, by their doctrine, to bind ‘the law of Moses’ upon men’s consciences, and to put on them a burden too heavy for them ‘to bear,’ as Peter speaks, verse 10, and had taught this to be the command of Christ and his apostles, and the judgment of the church of Jerusalem; they disclaim this, and profess they would have no such burden put upon them, and [that] they gave these teachers ‘no such commandment,’ that is, never delivered or uttered any such doctrine to be commanded! And if it be taken actively, yet the declaring it to be the command of Christ, is the imposition here intended: for the same words are used of the teachers who yet had not assumed, by virtue of an ecclesiastical authority, to impose these things; but, by way of doctrine: chap. xv. 10 and 5. And it is well known that, in Scripture phrase, to teach, and to declare, though by way of doctrine; and to press men’s consciences with things as the commands of God; is said to be a binding and imposing a burden on them. So of the Pharisees,—and these were ‘of the sect of the Pharisees’ of whom and to whom that was spoken, verse 5,—it is said, Matt. xxiii. 4, that ‘they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men’s shoulders;’ which is spoken but of a doctrinal declaring and pressing men’s consciences with the rigour of the Law: and this is so well known to be the language of the Jews, that it need not be insisted on. Neither doth it follow, that if they may lay these burdens, by way of doctrine, they may censure for the neglect of them: for every minister, in his sermon, imposeth those burdens while they urge and declare these duties to men, and yet have not power ecclesiastically to censure them. For though, it being a command of Christ, they could not but hold it forth as such, and so urge it; yet not by way of jurisdiction, but with these soft words, ‘Which if you observe, you do well!’ Lastly; although these false teachers had subverted their faith, verse 24, and against their

own light had vouched their doctrine to be the doctrine of the apostles—which deserved the highest censure, being a sin so scandalous,—yet they, verse 23, proceeded not to censure them, by way of admonition or excommunication—which are acts of government,—but only to *declare* their sin and error, and give their judgment of it!"^a

CHAP. LIX.

THE REASONS; OR, THE GRAND DEBATE; CONTINUED.

"REASONS against the last two assertions of the ASSEMBLY; concerning the instance of the Church of Jerusalem.

"Assertion i. 'Whether these Congregations be fixed, or not fixed, in regard of officers or members; it is all one, as to the truth of the Proposition.'

"Our reply.—Whereas in the close of the proofs from the Church of Jerusalem, for many congregations to be under one presbyterial government, it is asserted, 'Whether these congregations be fixed or not fixed, it is all one as to the truth of the Proposition:' this reason is offered against it:

"There is this difference: Every congregation, having elders fixed to it, is a CHURCH; for the relation of elders and church is mutual, Acts xiv. 23: 'They ordained elders in every church.' The relation, of elders to a church, is a special distinct relation to that congregation of which they are elders, so as, they are not related to other congregations. And these congregations are *ecclesiæ primæ*, churches formed up, though uncomplete, as being, according to our Brethren's opinion, members of a more general presbyterial church; but if congregations have no 'fixed officers,' they are not churches, according to their principles. Now, it makes a great difference, as to the truth of the Proposition, whether many churches may be under the government of one, or whether many congregations—which, to them, are no churches—may be under the government of one! Whatsoever our Brethren show of divers congregations to be under the government of a church-presbyterial, yet they nowhere show any one pattern or example, in Scripture, wherein many churches were under the power of one; nay, nor where any one church was under the power of another!

"Assertion ii. 'That there appears no material difference betwixt the several congregations in Jerusalem and the many congregations now, in the ordinary condition of the church, as to the point of fixedness in regard of officers and members.'

"Our reply.—And lastly: If there were many congregations in Jerusalem having their officers fixed to them, and not in common; then, during the time before the dispersion, the apostles must be those officers that were thus fixedly disposed of to their several congregations;

some over one, others over another, as ordinary elders now are. Now, suppose this number of 'believers' to have been as many thousands as is argued; as ten or twelve thousand souls, and these to be divided into as many congregations as might be divided to twelve apostles, severally to watch over: or, suppose the several congregations made up of two thousand—which is an allotment small enough to be set apart for the pains of two apostles: hereupon this great incongruity doth follow, These apostles are brought to the state and condition, and work of parish ministers! To whom yet, it was committed, and inseparably annexed to their office, yea and constituted it [their office], as apostles to have the care of 'all' churches [2 Cor. xi. 28.]; and if when the churches were multiplied and dispersed into several countries, they were to have 'the care' of them, then, much more, when they were in one city. Some of the writers against Episcopacy—when those that write for it, allege the instance of James abiding at Jerusalem as the bishop of that church,—have judged it a debasing of the apostolical powers to limit it to one diocesan church! But this position, doth debase all the apostles at once, much more; it makes them not bishops to many churches, but ordinary elders, in that one or two of them, perhaps, are over one single church. Yea, and which is yet more incredible, if these churches and their government were like to those under the Presbytery, and 'no material difference' between them and ours, these apostles were, in their parishes, not only subordinate, in their government, to the common presbytery of all the apostles, but limited to lesser acts of government: for so the lesser elderships in the churches under the Presbyterial government are confined only to examine and admonish, and prepare for the greater presbytery, and therein not enabled to ordain elders over the congregation, or excommunicate a member! Peter and John joined together were, by this principle, not enabled to it! And yet, if we do not suppose such a limited government in those several congregations, here can be no pattern for the Presbyterial government as it is practised. Or if, otherwise, we should suppose them 'fixed' officers, for teaching only, to one of those congregations, and to have no government at all over it, but to bring all to the common presbytery of apostles: that, is a greater incongruity than the former. For this, casts them below the condition of our parish Elders, for unto them the greater Presbytery doth allow some measure and part of the *government*; but such a supposition would allow apostles *none*, in their several congregations!"^a

"Other REASONS against the Main Proposition:

" 'The Scripture holds forth, That many congregations may be under one Presbyterial Government.'

"By Particular Congregations, either, first, an assembly of Christians meeting for worship only, as to hear, pray, etc.; or, secondly, an assembly so furnished with officers as, fit for discipline, having a presbytery, is meant. In the latter sense, which is that the proofs are brought to confirm, and that that is practised where this Government is set up, the Proposition is equivalent to such an assertion as this, Many presbyteries may be under presbyterial government; as thus,

^a P. 35, 36.

parochial presbyteries may be under one classical ; many classical under one provincial, etc. ; which is the same as to affirm, that one presbytery may be over another : as the Bishops affirm, That one presbyter may be over another ! This is evident, if you assert [that] a presbyterial government may be over a congregation that is composed of a presbytery and people : for it cannot be said to be over a congregation, if it be over the people, only ; that is, not over their presbytery also ; for then the presbytery will be independent, and the people under two presbyteries co-ordinate and not subordinate ; which stands not with common reason.

“ This then, being the Assertion, it is thus argued against : A presbytery over a presbytery, or power over power, necessarily implieth two sorts of presbyteries or ecclesiastical jurisdictions specially distinct, or at least more than numerically. A greater or lesser, varies not the kind, in a physical, or theological, consideration ; but in a political, it doth. He that hath a greater power than I have, that is, a power over my power ; a power to order, direct, or correct, the power I have ; this man’s power and mine differ as two sorts or kinds of power. And although this superior presbytery be made up of presbyters sent as commissioners from the congregational or parochial presbyteries ; yet this hinders not at all, but that they may be thus distinct : for some cities and towns corporate, their officers are sent up and sit as members of Parliament, yet *this* Honourable House hath a power distinct and superior to that which is in London or York. Though the superior presbytery be made up of presbyters from several congregations, yet it is made up of presbyteries ; it hath the persons materially considered, but not that power formally considered : for as while the Parliament sits and certain burgesses from borough towns sit as members in it, these towns notwithstanding still retain all the power those corporations were ever invested with ; so particular congregations whilst some of their elders sit in the classical presbytery, have elderships, or a presbytery, still. Now, that it is very probable the Scriptures hold not forth *two* sorts of Presbyteries, thus specifically distinct, may be thus argued :

“ First : Where the Scripture holds forth distinct sorts in any kind, there will be found either distinct and proper names and titles, or at least some adjunct or difference added to that which is common or general. In the apostles’ times, there were presbyters over presbyters ; apostles were superior to prophets ; and prophets a distinct order from teachers ; therefore, in 1 Cor. xii. 28, ‘ God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing,’ etc. They have not only particular names and titles, but special notes of distinction added, *πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας*’ as in Gen. i. 16, where no distinction of names is given, the sun, moon, and stars of heaven, are all called lights, yet there are terms of difference added ; they are called, first, ‘ great lights,’ and then, ‘ the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night.’ Throughout the New Testament, we find this word *πρεσβυτέριον* but in three places [Luke xxii. 66 ; Acts xxii. 5 ; 1 Tim. iv. 14], whereof there is but one that holdeth out the

Government in hand; and in that place, you have the naked word only, without the addition of any such expression—greater, lesser, superior, inferior,—or any kind of adjunct that can possibly put a thought in us of more presbyteries than one! Notwithstanding so useful are peculiar distinct names, where there are distinct sorts or kinds of administration, as it is not omitted by any church in their ordinances for government: in Scotland, the lowest is termed a ‘consistory;’ the next, a ‘classis’ or presbytery; the third, a ‘provincial synod;’ the fourth, a ‘general assembly:’ the French, in these terms, ‘consistories,’ and ‘colloquies,’ and ‘synods:’ so in the Episcopal Republic, there was the like variety.

“Secondly: As the Scriptures hold forth nothing, in any title or name, to distinguish; no more can we thence discover any sorts of government, different in nature. For trial of this, let it be supposed there is a parochial or consistorian presbytery, for one sort, [and that] there is another sort we call classical: what Scripture gives light, by any kind of reasoning, to warrant the setting up one of those above, or over the other? Do you read anywhere, God hath set in his church, first presbyteries, secondarily classes, then consistories? Or is there anything in the Word, directing a different composition, or constitution, in these? First; for the *materiale*: the persons that these presbyteries are made up of, are the same. The consistory hath gifted men set apart to the office of the ministry; those that are in a classical presbytery, are no otherwise qualified; nor, indeed, doth the Scripture require anything but a *presbyteration* to qualify men for any sort, if there were sorts of presbytery. That there is a greater number of presbyters, in the one than in the other; this alters not the state, in respect of the *matter*: for if the number be competent, that is, [if] so many as ‘two or three’ may ‘agree’—Matt. xviii.—it sufficeth. The Honourable House of Commons is, to all Parliamentary purposes, as much a House when but two or three above forty, as when four hundred. Nor doth this always fall out, that all classical presbyteries have a greater number than some parochial. Scriptures have determined neither how few will constitute a classical presbytery, nor how many may be in a parochial: practice, many times, makes them equal. Secondly; now for the *formale*: the uniting of this *matter* into a *consessus* or *cætus*. Presbyters become united into a presbytery in the classical, by having pastoral charges in such a division; whosoever cometh so to be disposed of, he is no sooner pastor to such a parish, but he is, *eo nomine*, member of such a classis: the presbyters of a parochial presbytery, are as nearly united, and more; they are united in the choice and call of the same congregation they govern, and united in the whole work of the ministry over the same people; so that they are not only fellow-governors but fellow-labourers in the same vineyard. There is, therefore, no just ground for such a distinction of difference between presbytery and presbytery, in respect either of the *matter* or the *form*.

“Thirdly: Nor do we find anything, in the Scriptures, making them, as from different employments, or functions, to differ. First; we [you] pretend, and so it is in the Proposition, the one is superior,

the other inferior : but how can you say the Scriptures have made this difference, when there is not a word spoken this way in any place ? Presbyterian writers themselves, in some expressions seem to take away utterly such difference as this. In one place, you shall read, The classis can do nothing *renitente ecclesia*, but it is null and invalid ! thus, ‘ The assertion for Discipline,’ and [which] avouches Zepperus, Zanchy, and others, as of this opinion. The congregation, though but *minima ecclesiola*, yet may reform, that is, suspend, excommunicate, etc. *Renitentibus correspondentibus* : so, Voetius, in his Theses, et Desperata causa Papatus : Lib. ii. cap. 12. Surely, according to what these reverend divines have expressed, it is hard to be said which of these presbyteries hath the greater or superior power ! Secondly ; the employment or work of a presbytery, is to ordain, excommunicate, suspend, admit members, appoint times for worship, and the like. The classical presbytery reserve ordination and excommunication to themselves ; but the other [acts] are left to [the] parochial presbytery : thus, some Presbyterians divide the work ; others, possibly otherwise. But how can we [you] affirm any such designment, from the Scriptures, if you have not two sorts, either in name or nature, to be found there ? And none of these acts, or administrations, but may be done by that one [sort] the Scripture mentioneth ; which, doubtless, they may [do], seeing ordination seemeth to be specified in the text : if the greater, then doubtless the lesser. The pastor, in one place, is said to ‘ exhort,’ in another, to ‘ comfort,’ in another, to ‘ visit the sick ;’ this will not warrant distinct sorts of pastors : for there being but one sort spoken of in Scriptures, we must interpret all these several administrations to belong to that one.

“ It was not found an easy work, in this ASSEMBLY, to find two sorts of elders, teaching and ruling, notwithstanding all the Scripture hath said of these ; and in some places, so plain as if on purpose to distinguish them ! If it be so hard a matter, by Scripture light, to hold forth two sorts of presbyters ; it must needs be more difficult, to find out two sorts of presbyteries ; especially, seeing—as it is generally granted, and this by the Presbyterians themselves,—that for above fifty years after Christ, and in the apostles’ times, there was but one kind of presbytery !

“ It hath been the wisdom of States, to keep and preserve the bounds and limits of their judicatures evident and distinct, and as free from controversy as may [might] be. If laws and ordinances about matters of *meum* and *tuum*, and such inferior claims, should not be so evident ; the authority of these courts, will be in a readiness to relieve wrongs and injuries through such mistakings : but controversies, and clashings, about these high and public interests, are no other, in the issue, than the dividing of a kingdom within itself.

“ Is man wiser in his generation, than Jesus Christ ? He is our ‘ Law-giver ;’ the ‘ Government’ is laid ‘ upon his shoulder :’ He is the ‘ Wonderful,’ [the] ‘ Counsellor,’ the ‘ Prince of Peace ;’ and therefore, surely, though other matters of practice and duty should have obscurity in the rule, yet it is most probable [that] He hath ordered authority and jurisdiction, with the officers and offices for the

managing of it, so evidently as not to put us to search in a dark corner for directions. We cannot be said to be clear in our rule, when we are thus enforced out of one word, and but once used 'to raise so many thrones,' or forms, of government; especially it being foreseen by Christ, that such is the nature of man as nothing occasions more bitter contention than that lusting which is in us, to have authority and jurisdiction over others!

THO. GOODWIN,

WILLIAM BRIDGE,

PHILIP NYE,

WILLIAM GREENHILL,

JER. BURROUGHES,

WILLIAM CARTER.^a

SIDRACH SIMPSON,

"REASONS against, . . the Proofs from, the Instance of the Church of EPHESUS; alleged by the Reverend Assembly to prove, That 'the Scripture holds forth, That many congregations may be under one presbyterial government.'

"To these Proofs,^b the answer is, First: As for such of them which are brought to prove the number of believers in Ephesus; the consequence is denied, because that notwithstanding what is said of the apostle being 'three years' at Ephesus, Acts xx. 31, and a great and effectual door was opened, 1 Cor. xvi. 9, and 'so mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed,' Acts xix. 20, it follows not that the converts in 'Ephesus' were so many as could not meet in one place. For, first, suppose it granted, there were two or three thousand—though there is no sufficient ground to say there were near so many,—yet they all might meet in one place; and yet this were enough to show that there was 'a large door and effectual opened' to the apostle, and a comfortable fruit of his so long stay and preaching there. Secondly, because this efficacy of the Word preached by Paul, hath reference not only to Ephesus, but also to 'all Asia,' chap. xix. 26; and where he saith, chap. xx. 31, the words are not to be restrained to his being at Ephesus, but to be understood of his being in Asia, as appears by verse 18.

"Secondly: As for 'the price' of the 'books' of the converts, Acts xix. 19; the answer is, That when there was no printing, a few men's 'books', yea a few books of so 'curious' and gainful 'arts', might well be worth that money. For that 'fifty thousand pieces of silver,' Calvin, upon the place, computes to be but nine thousand pounds French; which is six hundred and seventy-five pounds sterling, or thereabouts, at eighteen-pence the frank. Beza reckons it less, namely, eight thousand seven hundred pounds French. And our own countryman, Brerewood, in his first chapter, *de Nummis*, interpreting this very place, accounts every ἀργυρίου at seven-pence *ob.* [sic]; according to which rate the sum amounts to about one thousand four hundred and six pounds sterling. [?]ⁱ Some one man's study, now, of common books, though not manuscripts as they were, is worth as much: and how this can argue such a multitude of believers, or several congregations, as could not meet in one place, we cannot see.

"Thirdly: As for the 'church' in Aquila's 'house,' 1 Cor. xvi.

^a P 37—40.

^b See back p. 461.

19, which is supposed, by the Reverend Assembly, to be a congregation distinct from the Ephesians, and therefore 'more congregations than one' making that one Ephesine church so much spoken of in the New Testament: the Answer is, first, The church in his 'house' is not necessarily to be understood of a congregation, such as the Proposition intends; but of a family-church, as most of our divines say. Secondly, suppose it were such; it doth not appear that the 'church' in Aquila's house was at Ephesus, but in 'Asia.' We read that Aquila and Priscilla travelled with Paul to Ephesus, and were left there; not that their 'church' was there, for themselves might travel where their 'church' travelled not with them. Thirdly, grant they were such a church, and at Ephesus; yet the answer is, They were strangers that were driven from Rome by Claudius, Acts xviii. 2, compared with Rom. xvi. 3—5, where also we read of a 'church' in their 'house'; and therefore [they] kept themselves a distinct 'church' from the Ephesians, as the English do in the Netherlands and the Dutch in England, who choose rather to join with their own country-people whose dwellings are more remote, than with those of another nation nearer to them. And if the difference of their language may argue different congregations, and that they could not join in one,—as is alleged;—it will argue as strongly that this church, and the other congregation of Ephesus, could not be under one presbyterial government! and ordinary officers had not, ordinarily, the gift of several tongues, 1 Cor. xii. 8—10.

“Fourthly: As for 'Jews and Greeks' being mentioned; it makes nothing for the number, nor yet that for difference of language there must needs be more congregations than one; for the Jews that lived among the Gentiles, understood their language; else they would make so many *independent* congregations!

“The contrary to this first Proposition, namely, 'That the multitude of believers were more than could meet in one place;' is proved thus: It is apparent that the number of believers there when Paul came first to Ephesus was but 'about twelve,' Acts xix. 7; and when the number was increased, yet then the church of Ephesus is called one 'flock,' in relation to those 'elders' which were at Ephesus,—xx. 17, 28;—which were willed by Paul 'to feed' that flock by doctrine, as he had done; by which it is evident, they might and did meet in one: for elders are pastors only for one congregation.

“It was said, That the feeding of this 'flock,' is to be understood *partitive*, namely, some one congregation; some, another; and so, amongst them, the 'flock' was fed. But if it be understood *partitive*, with reference to their *feeding*, it must be also with reference to their *overseeing*; because it is so expressed in the text: for no reason can be given why these words 'feed the flock [the church of God]', should be understood *partitive*, and not these other words, 'take heed . . . to the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.' And if their overseeing and ruling be to be understood *partitive*, then how doth this place argue a presbyterial government over many congregations? And if it be said, the many congregations were not fixed ones, then that distinction, of feeding *partitive*, falleth to the ground.

“Whereas it is replied, ‘That the same place as used 1 Pet. v. 2, must be understood *partitivè*, because those believers and elders to whom the apostle Peter writes were ‘scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,’ chap. i. 1, which could not meet in one congregation:’ it is answered, first, That in this place of Peter there are no such words whereby the relation of the whole flock is equally carried to all those elders, as there are in that speech of the apostle [Paul] to the elders of Ephesus, Acts xx. 28, ‘take heed to *the whole flock*, over which—whole flock—the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.’ Secondly, in this, 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, there are words which plainly point at such a *distribution*, namely, ἐν ὑμῖν, ‘among you’ applied both to the elders and to the flock: ‘the elders . . . ἐν ὑμῖν, —among you—I exhort . . . to feed the flock . . . ἐν ὑμῖν’ that is, each elders, feed your flocks respectively wherever they are ‘among you,’ in each country: therefore, though it be understood *partitivè* in Peter, yet it follows not it should be so understood Acts xx. 28.

“And if it be said further, ‘That although ruling and teaching be applied to the same ‘flock,’ the elders need not be both alike understood *partitivè* to perform their office; because elders when they rule, do it *in consessu*, and all join in every act; but when they teach, they do it severally, each by himself; therefore, where ruling and teaching are applied to elders as over one flock, as they are Acts xx., they may well be supposed to do the one *partitivè*, the other not:’ the answer is, It is true, where elders rule they do it *in collegio* whether over more or fewer, and when they teach they do it severally; but still, both ruling and teaching are to be within the same compass in respect of them who are ruled and taught: for when elders rule over a congregation *in collegio*, yet each of these elders oversees and rules ‘the whole flock’ as truly as he can be said, by teaching, to feed that whole flock.

“As for the second and third Propositions, That there were many elders over that people as one flock and one church: and, That they did govern this one flock: the former Proposition not being proved; they make nothing to the proof of that conclusion, That the Scripture holds forth, That many congregations may be under one presbyterial government.”^a

Subscribed, as before, p. 494.

“Propositions of the ASSEMBLY, concerning SYNODS :

“‘I. The Scripture doth hold out another sort of assemblies for the government of the church, besides classical and congregational, which we call Synodical, Acts xv.

“‘II. Synodical assemblies may, lawfully, be of several sorts; as provincial, national, and oecumenical.

“‘III. It is lawful, and agreeable to the Word of God, that there be a subordination of congregational, classical, provincial, and national assemblies; that so appeals may be made from the inferior to the superior, respectively. Proved from Matt. xviii., which holding forth the subordination of an offending Brother, to a particular church; it doth also, by a parity of reason, hold forth the subordination of a congregation, to superior assemblies.

“‘And it is agreeable to the light of nature, That he who is wronged and deprived of his right, by one power, should have recourse to another power which

^a P. 81—85.

may restore unto him his right again, and rescind the sentence by which he was wronged: else there would be no powerful remedy provided, to remove wrong and to preserve right.'

"To the latter Proposition, about the Subordination of Synods, the Dissenting Brethren entered their dissent after the debate, and [gave in] their REASONS in writing, as followeth.

"ARGUMENTS of the Dissenting Brethren, AGAINST 'The Subordination of Synods,' etc.

"Although we judge 'Synods' to be of great use for the finding out and declaring of truth in difficult cases, and encouragement to walk in the truth; for the healing [of] offences; and to give advice unto the magistrate, in matters of religion: and, although we give great honour and conscientious respect unto their determinations: yet seeing the Proposition holds forth, not only an occasional but a standing use of them, and that in 'subordination' of one unto another, as juridical, ecclesiastical courts, and this in all cases; we humbly present these Reasons against it:

"First Argument: All such 'subordinations' of courts having greater and lesser degrees of power, to which, in their order, causes are to be brought, must have the greatest and most express warrant and designment for them in the Word. Whence it is argued thus, Those courts that must have the most express warrant and designment for them in the Word, and have not; their power is to be suspected, and not erected in the church of God: but these, ought to have so; and have not: therefore, etc.

"The first part of the Minor, is thus proved: There ought to be the greatest and most express warrant, and that for two things belonging to them. First, for their subordination and number; secondly, for their bounds and limits of power. And because this principle is made use of, both in the point in hand and other of like nature, namely, To argue *à pari ratione*,—from like and parallel reason,—the argument to establish this Proposition shall proceed, accordingly, from the strength of 'like reason' in other cases and instances, That there ought to be a warrant and designment for them, in the Word.

"i. From 'like reason,' in the case of 'subordination' of Officers in the church, one over another; there was a special Institution, and it is required, or we own them not: and that for intensive power, and extensive power; and therefore, for the 'subordination' of such Courts also! The rule of proportion holds: for, a government of and by several subordinations—whether of one church-officer or person over another and of him over others, or of a many in the like degree of subordination,—are but several forms of government of which there is the 'like reason' in common: as if subordination in a monarchical way, wherein still but some one person is superior to another, downwards; or in an aristocratical way throughout; in this they come all to one, That if there be to be an Institution, or warrant, for the one, there is to be for the other: whether God or men be to be the institutors of them. Now, in the government of the church, for the subordination of Officers there was an express Institution; or men ought not to have assumed it: 'God hath set' in his 'church, first apostles,

secondarily prophets' and evangelists—who were of a parallel order,—
 'thirdly teachers,' 1 Cor. xii. 28; and the difference of power in
 apostles and evangelists, is by 'subordination:' but Christ, hath not
 set the like subordination of Courts!

“ ii. It is proved from what the [those of] Presbyterial principles,
 themselves, reject. An Institution is required by them, in the case of
 subordination of bishops, archbishops, popes, in their arguing against
 them and their power: yea and by the Episcopal writers themselves
 who, when it is objected, That if there may be a bishop, and an arch-
 bishop over him; why not a patriarch over archbishops, and a pope over
 all? They deny this, and reject a patriarch, or pope, although with
 renouncing of infallibility, as not warranted by the Word: they say, a
 higher and more universal 'subordination' alters the case. And the
 usual exception against this subordination of church-governors is,
 That, in Scripture, we read neither of the name of an archbishop nor
 the thing; and therefore, not of a 'subordination' of them. The
 like may be said of these: where read we of councils provincial, national;
 names or things? Yea, and in this way of arguing—in this respect—
 the disadvantage is on this side rather: for we are sure that once there
 was in the church such a 'subordination' in church officers; evangelists
 over pastors, apostles over evangelists—only they were extraordinary,
 and so no patterns;—but of such a subordination of councils, in an
 aristocratical way, there is nothing to be found.

“ iii. It is argued from 'like' and just 'reason' in other societies,
 and bodies politic. In all kingdoms and commonwealths well-ordered
 and constituted, there is and ought to be a set and express order, by
 the laws, both of the number and bounds of courts of judicatory, from
 whom and to whom appeals are made, and in what cases, etc. And
 that this 'subordination' should be set forth and fixed by the law, is
 as necessary as the laws or rules by which men in a kingdom are to be
 governed. The wisdom of the law doth judge it not enough to appoint
 several sorts of officers—as to say, counsellors, sergeants, judges,—but
 designeth also and appointeth several courts with their power and
 bounds; the designment of which, especially of standing courts—
 being made up of these,—is a matter of much more moment than the
 other: yea, and still the greater and higher such courts and assemblies
 are having amplitude of power over others, the more express evidence
 and warrant for their power there is and ought to be; as for Parlia-
 mentary power, and the privileges thereof. And this is evident, as
 from the examples of all kingdoms, so from what the Scripture speaks
 of the constitution of them. Each part of the 'subordination' of
 such power in all government, both is and also was called a 'creation
 of men' in things human, whether it be in a monarchical or aristocratical
 way; 'submit yourselves to every human creation'—*ἀνθρώπινῃ κτίσει*.
 1 Pet. ii. 13. And he speaks there, evidently of—and therefore thus
 styleth—the 'subordination' of powers in a commonwealth, whether
 officers or courts; for it follows, 'whether unto the king, as supreme;
 or unto governors, as those that are sent by him, etc.;' and so here,
 'subordination' of power under him. Now, parallel spiritual and
 ecclesiastical government with this: as in the rearing a human fabric

and contignation of power, there must be an 'ordinance' or 'creation' from man, when God hath left the framing of it unto him—as in this case, he hath—so this 'subordination' being in Divine power, there must be a Divine Institution of it, besides that of the distinction of the officers themselves.

“ iv. It is argued from 'like reason' with Christ's institution, Matt. xviii. If in a particular church, Christ hath prescribed the several subordinations of proceedings, and set forth the degrees, bounds, and order of them; then, much more it is required in these, by how much a larger extent of power is committed to them. The first rule, in Matt. xviii., is, 'If thy brother offend thee, tell him thyself;' then secondly, 'Take two or three, and if he hear not them,' thirdly, 'Tell the church:' verses 15—17. If there were a thousand brethren in a congregation, a man were not bound nor were it orderly, in an ordinary and set way, to 'take,' as the church shall please, first two or three, and then ten, and then twenty, and still the like proportion of a greater number, ere he come to the church itself; but Christ hath set the order, and his wisdom saw it meet thus to design and limit the proceedings in a particular church. And it had been much more necessary to have appointed the like, about these general and greater assemblies; because every one of these courts—*intended*—has the power of a sentence and judgment, whereas those 'two or three' proceed but in a way of admonitions in order to a superior court. Shall Christ take care for Congregations,—which are esteemed the meanest,—and not for these? of which, if Christ should not have set the bounds of power and subordination thereof, none would know what belongs to them; who is in fault, if offences be not corrected; nor would any know whom first to appeal unto. 'I will appeal unto the national assembly first,' says one, 'and am not bound to the classical or provincial!' Another would say, 'I will appeal to a general council, which can best judge, and will be sure to make an end of it!' Why should any be hindered for going *per saltum*, if Christ have not set forth and obliged us to these 'subordinations' in their order?

“ v. In the church of the Jews, the 'subordinations' that were, were set forth and determined by Institution, or example; how many courts there should be, and where to rest: there were the 'courts' of the cities and the towns; and then, their 'sanhedrim,' to which the case was to be carried, if it were too hard for their particular courts; and no other courts between, appointed, Deut. xvii. In the New Testament, we have for removing scandals a Congregational standing court and government—or be it a classical standing presbytery over many congregations, as our Brethren say;—and we have an example also, of going out from a particular standing church—whether the one or the other—electively, to another church, or churches, when divisions are therein, which Acts xv. holds forth; but still for such standing 'subordinations' and courts as these, out of the church, nothing at all! If there had been any national sanhedrim, a set and constant judicatory, then Christ would have appointed it, as he had done before; but he hath not, no example, no Institution, holds it forth! Which is the second part of the Minor Proposition: thus proved,

“i. The New Testament is silent in it. And if it be said, That all nations were not then converted when the apostles wrote: it is answered, That God, in the Old Testament, took care to set the order aforehand, when they had no cities nor were settled in the land. And, accordingly, if the apostles had not lived to see that which might occasion such an institution, or precept, yet they would some way have left order for time to come.

“ii. But though the apostles lived to see many famous particular churches erected in a province as well as in cities; in a nation, as in Judea, in Asia, in Crete, there were many cities and churches in each. And although all the people in these countries were not Christian, nor members of churches, yet there was matter for the moulding and casting them into these ‘subordinations’ as well as now in France, where not the third part are Protestants, or in the Low Countries where not the tenth part of the inhabitants are members of their churches; and sure if these superstructions had been so absolutely necessary, in the government of the churches, it had been as necessary to have appointed them: they set up and appointed all needful remedies for ordering the churches after them, when they should be gone. And it is more strange that, in the case of the spreading of errors, they should not write to churches as gathered into ‘synods!’ And, as having the standing power to prevent and suppress them—if such ordinary standing assemblies, armed with coercive power, had been then in that existence, as now,—that upon no occasion this should be done, when yet they had occasions! Take the ‘seven churches in Asia,’ Ephesus, Thyatira, Smyrna, with the rest of the churches therein—a Province—and though therein we find many great disorders, and some in doctrine—the more proper work of these standing ‘synods’—yet we see that Christ writes only to each of those churches apart, and reprove each for their disorder in each; whereas had they been one church in such a standing association for government, and had had ordinary provincial and national assemblies extant, as now, the reproof would have been especially directed thereunto: as if errors and disorders were in the classical churches—as those all are pretended to be—of Scotland, the chief rebuke would now more justly fall upon the national and provincial assemblies, as their constitution is.

“iii. Yea, the Holy Ghost would have at least vouchsafed to these or some other churches—that were, in like manner, in a nation, or province, as Galatia, etc.—in respect of such a combination, the name of a church; who must, according to the principles of this government, have had so much of the power of a church: but no where are the churches in a province called a church, but churches, in the plural. And if the lesser churches, then these; yea, rather, these having most of the power, should therefore have had most of the name! Yea, and by how much the church-power thereof, should have been most independent—as a nation is—and so come most eminently within that rule, ‘Tell the church;’ from which words these pretend their power, and yet cannot show so much title thereto as to have the name ‘church’ given them; let a rational account be given of this.

“Second Argument: If there be such a ‘subordination’ of synods

in the church of Christ; then, there is no independency but in an oecumenical council: which, first, would bring in a foreign ecclesiastical power over each state and kingdom: and, secondly; therefore of all other, should have its designation and existence in the Word; and is more needful than the other two sorts of synods mentioned; for if any should be extant, then that which is *remedium efficacissimum*. It is said, there is wanting *remedium efficax*, if their 'subordinations' be not; but according to these principles, there is wanting that which is the most efficacious 'remedy' if a General Council be not extant in the world; for if there be not a resting in a classical presbytery, but provincial also must be and appealed to, neither are they reckoned efficacious enough but there must be national also—upon this supposition, that the greater assembly hath more of the promise and assistance of Christ than the lesser,—then, of all others, a General Council must be supposed in a transcendent manner above all the rest to have the promise of assistance made to it; and so to be the most eminently efficacious, if not the only 'remedy' on earth, yea, and only to be rested in, being that which only is the ultimate! Some of the Papists, they gave this to such a General Council, That it cannot err: but according to these principles of Presbyterial divines, though it might err, yet it is supposable to be transcendentally more infallible than all the other under it, and God more with it than with all the rest; and, therefore, God, in his Word, would have given especially, order for this above all other. And the same God that suits his providences to his institutions, would not have failed in what is the most sovereign 'remedy' of all other, that it might have been existent in all ages; as we see his promise was, to the Jews, to keep their land when the males thrice a year went up to the General Assembly at Jerusalem; but three hundred years the churches wanted them, and could not enjoy them; and they were judged, therefore, not necessary to the government of the church; which yet, according to these principles, must have been the most necessary of all the rest!

"Yea, and further also; thirdly, there must be an injurious independency set up in a national synod: for when a man hath appealed from one court to another and comes to this national, that is the ultimate existent, and upon the sentence thereof comes next to be banished out of a nation, to have his estate forfeited to the ruin of himself and posterity, then it is that he most of all needs the relief of a higher 'remedy' more efficacious than all these he hath gone through, if such a one may be: yet then, he is left remediless and, he [is] according unto these principles, left more unsatisfied than ever; because, thinks he, There is, by God's appointment, a Court that hath more of God and of Christ in it than all these, to judge of the truth and right; and lo! it is not; and can never be expected! Let it be withal, considered that when God appointed a 'subordination' of standing courts, he withal designed-out which should be the supreme, and made it the ultimate; and the supremacy and independency of it in a set and standing way, was his Institution, as much as the appointment of the court itself. So that, he was to be put to death that obeyed not the sentence of it; and all appeals were thereby cut off. Therefore, if a

national church doth take upon it to be an independent church, upon the sentence thereof to have the extremest punishment executed—but that of death—that, in a nation, men are capable of; it had need, for the quieting of all men's spirits that must submit to it, not only show a warrant from God for it to be an ecclesiastical judicatory, but also to be the supreme court, as the sanhedrim was, that appeals should be made to.

“Third Argument: To that end, let it be examined, What set rules there are or may be supposed to be, of these ‘subordinations,’ and their bounds; and the ultimate independency in a national church. Which should be fetched from some standing considerations which the Word warrants: God never having constituted a church, but he gave the bounds thereof. All variation of church-power is from God: the alteration of the government of his people, the Jews, from family government,—which had been, under the law of nature,—to national, in Moses’ time, was by express appointment. And as Himself made and constituted it a national church, so there was an ecclesiastical government framed by Himself suited thereunto. And in the New Testament, there is ‘a reed’ to ‘measure the temple,’ Rev. xi. 1: a rule, to set out the limits of church-power, as well as under the Old: and therefore the Argument is framed thus:

“That church power which cannot show a constant Divine rule for its variation and subordination, and ultimate independency, is not of God, and so may not be. But this variation of church power into these subordinations, cannot show any such steady and constant rule for these things. Therefore, etc.

“The Major is evident, from what hath been said: the Minor is made good, by a removal of all particulars that may be supposed to be the square of framing these ‘subordinations,’ etc.

“i. Not that rule, That the greater number or company of churches should rule the less; and, that the whole should rule the part: for then, i. There would be as many several ‘subordinations’ as there can be supposed variations of greater numbers: and that will arise to more than these three only. Every new greater company, would constitute a new ‘synod.’ 2. Where is the promise of God, That he will be more with the greatest part of them that profess Christianity rather than with a few, so far as to constitute a new power and government? 3. Yea, the greater number of churches professing religion are more corrupted; the purer churches are fewer! It had been ill for ‘Philadelphia’ and the angel and elders thereof, if those ‘seven churches in Asia’ had been cast into such a ‘subordinate’ association for government, to be exercised by the angels and elders of all the other six churches, with the rest, in Asia. And the like may be said, of the purer reformed churches in Germany; if the greater number of those, that yet were true churches, should have ruled the lesser; then, the Lutherans and Calvinists being bound to this government, the Lutherans, being also true churches and the more in number, would, by virtue of this law, have soon corrupted the purer. And, what reason can be pretended—according to this rule, and the principles of this government,—to leave, any true churches out of an association? 4. Suppose there should

be as many elders and churches more purely reformed, in one province or shire than in the rest of a whole nation besides,—as instance might be given, in some of the Reformed churches, that there are,—why should not God be thought to be as much with them as with the National Assembly? And if all are to give themselves up to this law; how will the greater which is the worse, either corrupt the purer or oppress them? 5. If *quâ* greater; then, the decrees of [the] greater, namely, General Councils, in former ages, should bind us more than national, or provincial, now; for they should have had more of *church* in them by this rule, and so more of Christ: and then, all General Councils that set up Popes, and Bishops, and all other superstitions, are still binding! If it be said, We chose them not: yet still that is not the ground which makes their decrees less divine, or obliging, to us; but it lieth in the authority of God's ordinance, That they were the greater and more general councils. And however, still, if this be the rule, That the greater number of churches rule the less: then, take the measure of this greatness and number of churches, from time, stretching the line over all ages past; as well as from the more number of churches in such or such a place, or nations, in the present times; and so look, what General Councils for most ages of the world did establish, should, by virtue of this law, oblige the present times, and have more force upon us than the universal church in this present age, much more than of any National Assembly; if either be simply considered under a mere ecclesiastical obligation—that is, *quâ* greater; and more of church! Time varieth not the case so, but that all their acts, having been acts of the church universal, in all ages, should comparatively stand more in force. The acts of any [of] the last General Councils will stand in force until a General Council of like extent repeal those acts; as the statutes of Parliament of our ancestors do, if not repealed by like and equal authority.

“ii. It is not the notion or consideration of their being churches in such or such a nation, or province, that can be the *rule* of making this obligation, or setting of these bounds. It must be considered, the question is of a mere ecclesiastic obligation by virtue of church-principles, such as should have been a just rule and measure to the primitive churches—ere princes turned christian,—to have reared the like ‘subordinations.’ Now then, the limits, from hence, must either rise from being, first, one church in a kingdom under the same civil government; or, secondly, one church in a nation: that is, either from a national respect or political. First, in general from neither; for this instance, Acts xv., of the council there, its rise, or the bounds of its authority, was founded upon neither: for if either natural or political respects should have obliged them, they should have sent to Syria and Cilicia, and not to Jerusalem, who were both under a differing government—civil, and of another nation! But more particularly; first, not *quâ* church in one kingdom; for that is *per accidens* to a church that it grows up to a kingdom, or that the whole nation is converted to christianity. And therefore, a set *rule* for all times cannot be fetched from hence: this, could not be the certain ‘measure’ of the independency of church-power, in the apostles’ times. Secondly, this makes

the bounds of ecclesiastical independency and jurisdiction uncertain; varying as the bounds of kingdoms do vary. When the Roman empire had all kingdoms under it, all the churches must then have been obliged to have had General, standing, Councils, suited to the extent of the empire, to have been the next unto the provincial; such as the national are now to the provincial: or else, before the empire turned christian, there were, by this rule, even as many independencies as churches. And then, again, when this empire was broken into ten kingdoms, yea and many more, there arose, instead of the former, many new independent boundaries of church-power;—of which only, the question is; and not of that power which a church doth come to have, and, simply and alone, holds of the magistrates; which will be merely civil.—And then, as kingdoms vary by conquests; the like alteration, the bounds of church-power must receive. Among the Jews it did not; for when the church was broken into two kingdoms, by God's appointment, yet the church-state, by God's Institution varied not, but was still one church. All these things are, therefore, mere accidentals to church-power; and, how can they be the foundation of the bounds of it?

“iii. Lastly; If this independency, ariseth from the magistrates; then, there is no need of such ‘subordinations.’ Which is proved by experience, in Reformed Churches abroad; who are well enough governed without these ‘subordinations.’ Geneva hath no appeals, yet is governed by one classical church; and why may not all other churches be governed as well without them, if the magistrate oversees them, and keeps each to their duties? The churches in the Low Countries want national synods, and yet are peaceably governed: yea, some for a long time are without provincial; and say, if they can they will never have more; and yet are peaceably and quietly governed! It is as the civil magistrate will, [to] terminate the independency, and himself overlook it [the church]. Or, secondly; if these bounds be fetched for national respects: then, first, in Germany, Calvinists must be subject to the greater number of Lutherans; and, in this kingdom, all ministers must make up this association; and the greater number will be the worse, and malign and oppose the good. If because the Calvinists profess a further Reformation, they are dis-obliged from associating with the Lutherans; then, those in any nation, that profess a further reformation than others, are free, by the same law also. Surely, UNIFORMITY OF PRINCIPLES, is a more intimate bond of such association, than any such outward, extrinsical, respects! Secondly, if *quâ* nation, or principality; then Wales must be independent. Thirdly, if *quâ* nation; then, if nation be taken for a people of the same tongue and kindred, then all the christian Jews, in the primitive times, when ‘scattered’ into a [any] nation, were bound to have made one church, distinct from all the churches they cohabited with: if nation, be taken for a proper dwelling in the same natural bounds; then, the same Jews, being ‘dispersed’ into several countries and nations, must have made one church with the several nations where they lived; whereas Peter, in his epistles, and James in his; and Paul, to the Hebrews; write unto the Jews apart, as churches in all nations!

“Fourth Argument: That government which, necessarily, produceth representations of spiritual power out of other representations, with a derived power therefrom; there is no warrant for. But these ‘subordinations’ of synods, provincial, national, oecumenical, for the government of the church, do so.

“The Major, shall be spoken to after the Minor Proposition is both cleared and proved; which is done by putting two things together.

“Minor: First. That if there be an authoritative ‘subordination’ of all churches in the provinces, to a national assembly, and so of many nations to an oecumenical, binding unto subjection; that then, all in the provinces, must be interested in that national; and all in the nation in that oecumenical; so as, it may be said, that they are all involved and included, and, so, obliged: as it is in Parliamentary-power, wherein the Shires are involved. Secondly: That this interest in this ‘subordination’ cannot arise, but either by immediate choice of those elders which shall represent each church and congregation immediately,—which is the case of our Parliament men, chosen immediately, by those they represent;—or else, that the provincial elders, sent by the congregations, shall choose out of themselves, some few that shall represent the provinces; and so likewise, the national assemblies shall choose out some few, which shall represent the whole nation in a General Council. Now, the first of these is not, nor can be, in the choice of a national assembly: congregations meet not for any such immediate choice; but the elders of them all choose out of themselves: so as, the obligation of all the churches to be subject to a national assembly—arising out of those other ‘subordinations,’—is not because they are a greater number of elders or divines,—for, in a provincial synod, there may be assembled as many as in the national,—but it ariseth from hence, That some, out of all, do represent the rest. And if they did not meet and vote as representers of the whole, then when a national assembly sits, in a great city, all other, neighbour ministers, might come and vote with them, and out-vote them who are the representers of the whole.

“Major: Now, That such a representation, having a derived spiritual power from other representations, is not, in matters spiritual, warrantable:—besides all arguments against delegated power in matters spiritual; all ministers being, immediately, Christi vicarii; and that all such representations grow weaker, as reflections use to do; elders represent the churches in classical and provincial assemblies, as being, immediately, chosen by them, but the elders in national assemblies are the representations of elders in provinces, and so are a shadow of that first shadow, whereas yet, they have the most power; even all that can be supposed to belong to the whole substance.—Besides such considerations, it is argued thus:

“i. If these few, out of nations, in a General Council should bind all those nations in matters spiritual; and a few, out of provinces, the nation; they must be supposed to have the Promise and an assistance answerable: but where is either the promise, or, can gifts in a few, be supposed to produce such an obligation? It is true, ‘when two or three are gathered together,’ His promise is, to be ‘in the midst of them,’ Matt. xviii. 20; and so suppose, with more when more are met:

but that His promise should be, to be with a few, out of a nation, as with the whole nation; and those, not chosen, immediately, by the nation, and but the representers of them; cannot be expected. It is granted, that each so met hath the gifts and assistance of an elder, and so, the whole, as of so many elders met—as we, in this Assembly met together, are to be looked upon, and the judgments thereof accordingly revered;—but that as they are elders representative of hundreds of other elders who, themselves, are representers of churches, That any such addition, should arise to them by virtue of this duplicated representation, over and above what is in their single gifts and office; let either a warrant be produced, or a promise! Two things are allowed them, but a third denied them; first, it is granted they may have assistance to judge as elders, which is their office: secondly, assistance to judge according to their personal abilities, being thus called to give their advice: but, thirdly, such a superadded assistance, as holds proportion to that spiritual bulk and body which they represent, is denied them. For suppose that always it falls out, that the best and choicest of a nation are chosen; yet still not to hold proportion to the whole nation: there must be more than an ordinary promise for it; and, therefore, had need be express and evident! When the Jesuits say, that the Pope may err as *persona privata*, but not as *Pontifex*, when he is in his chair representing the whole church; Davenant confutes them thus, ‘*Officium dat auctoritatem judicandi, sed privatae personae conditiones dant modum et facultatem:*’ *De Judice et Normâ Fidei*; Pref. That it is otherwise in commonwealths, is because they being human creations [1 Pet. ii. 13, *ut sup.* Arg. I. iii.], the represented can set up a power which shall represent them; but this ‘power’ we speak of is supernatural, and must be from God, and His Institution. The sanhedrim of Jerusalem, had a special assistance above all courts else, and therefore God appointed causes to be brought to it; which special assistance is intimated twice in the institution of it, by this, that they should ‘go up to the place which God shall choose,’ and ‘do according to the sentence which they of that place which the Lord shall choose, shall show;’ Deut. xvii. 8, 10. An emphasis is put upon that blessing which, by God’s choice and election, did accompany ‘that place’ which God had chosen to put his Name [there], and promised to be in an eminent manner present in, and to accept their sacrifices there offered—which was a representative worship, of that nation,—and not elsewhere. Now, as it was the representative worship of the nation, so these governors were the representative governors of that nation; and both sanctified in ‘that place,’—as the gift was by ‘the altar’ [Exod. xxix. 37],—as that which God had chosen. If the like Institution were found with the intimation of such a blessing—from a peculiar choice of God—of National Assemblies, all ought to [be] subject to them, in matters spiritual!

“ii. If there be such representations as these, in one, or few, persons, of many churches; they have each for that time, whilst in such an assembly, archiepiscopal and episcopal power: and their case is parallel—parallel then, as for that time and occasion and as met in a ‘synod,’—with that of so many bishops met in a council; whose episcopal

power as then and therein met lies in this, That they are so many churches-representative! Especially this would fall out, if these 'synods' should still consist of the same men; or if some few should be always chosen to them. And why may these not be standing persons, that are more skilful in such affairs, through exercise; as well as standing assemblies themselves? And then, as touching matters of jurisdiction, in such an assembly they are, for the present, the same with so many bishops met in a Convocation!

"iii. If these representations, having the power of all the churches in the nation, were warrantable, they must be a Church: now, besides that they are nowhere so called; and, if they were called so, then they are a 'body' to Christ, for so every church is, [1 Cor. x. 17]; and, where is Christ said to have a representative body of his 'body'? They are a company of elders personally gathered; but a representative church, they are not, nor can be: and yet must be, or they have not the power of all the churches, in a nation, in them; nor, otherwise, do their acts oblige them to subjection."^a

"REASONS against the allegation of Acts xv., for the Subordination of Synods, provincial, national, oecumenical.

"Besides what hath been said, against this example alleged to prove presbyterial acts of government by the elders of the church of Jerusalem, in the Reasons formerly presented; proving, first, That this one example, cannot serve to prove both the presbyterial government and synodical; but that if the Reverend Assembly will lean to the one, the other must be quitted: and, secondly, That that Assembly, was not a formal synod; but only a reference by the particular church of Antioch, of their differences among themselves, unto this particular church of Jerusalem and [to] no other: it may be, moreover, observed, That the example of it, is here further extended to prove all sorts of 'synods' and 'subordinations' thereof, 'provincial, national, and oecumenical;' and so it must suit all these so great varieties; whereas, it is not fit for any one of them!

"But if it had been a 'synod;' yet, first, neither provincial nor national; for Antioch consults not with the churches of her own nation, but seeks to Jerusalem, a church of Judea, of another nation and another province. Neither, secondly, is it the instance of a *standing* synod—which the word 'subordination,' in the Proposition, doth necessarily infer, or else the links of those chains will not hang together,—but *elective*; for they sent out of election and choice to them, and to them but about this one question at this time, without any obligation to refer all other matters to them in an ordinary way. Nor, thirdly, was there a multiplication of synods; but only one, in whose judgment those of Antioch rested. Fourthly; much less is it the instance of rearing up of a 'subordination' and contignation of synods, superior and inferior, which is a further thing. For though, when offences are not healed, and one reference to other churches is not sufficient to cure them, there should be a seeking to others; yet the example, obligeth the churches that are in difference, not to take and choose the churches

^a P. 114—128.

of *that* province, either as of that province or as the greater number to whom, both those among whom the controversy is and these to whom it was afore referred, must be subordinately subject; much less doth it hold forth, that the churches of that province, may, judicially, challenge a right of authority to decide it, and oblige them sub pœna to their determination; and then, the churches of that whole nation, challenge the like over all! But still it runs in this way only, That those who shall be judged meetest, and ablest, and faithfullest, to determine and compose it, by those who are to refer it, shall have the hearing of it.

“The argument of the Reverend Assembly was drawn from ‘like reason’—[‘a parity of reason’]—; and let there be ‘like’ reason, and it is granted. And though [they would say] the instance, is not the pattern of a formal ‘synod,’ yet it holds forth this rule of equity, That when offences arise among churches references ought to be made from out of themselves to churches abroad, to heal them. But the question is, to what churches, those references are to be made, and how? Let the ‘like reason,’ held forth in the example, be kept unto, and decide it! Say we, still, To those churches, the churches offended, or divided, shall choose as fittest and ablest to determine it. This is clear in the example, Antioch was not bound to refer it to the church of Jerusalem as greater, or as a neighbour church, or of the same province; but as best able to judge of the differences! And this way, agrees with the law of nature; and of arbitration so usual amongst men, which God hath there set up as an ordinance, and pattern of proceeding in such case. But this ‘subordination of synods,’ the Proposition intends, holds so differing a course from this, as, first, instead of *elective* ‘synods,’ and occasional; it sets up standing and set, to be the judge of the churches under them, for ever; secondly, not in one case, as Antioch to Jerusalem; but in all cases, whatever shall fall out: thirdly, not in a way of multiplication, or diversification, as need shall be; but of ‘subordination’ and settled superiority: and the grounds of this, to be, because the greater must rule the less; and, that they are neighbour churches in the same province, or nation. And this, Acts xv. is so far from countenancing by a par ratio, that in all things it is unlike: and so, there is a differing constitution and rule of these ‘synods’ thus subordinate, and what the ‘reason’ drawn from Acts xv. will warrant: and therefore, doth make a differing formal ‘reason’ in the government.

“And human prudence, added, will not rectify it; when the ‘reason’ of the institution is so much varied from. For instance: If the fundamental law, for remedy of wrongs and deciding controversies in any kingdom, were, by arbitration elective, to take them to be their judges whom the parties in difference judge aptest every way for the present controversy, and that the precedents and ruled cases hold forth no more; and if the government of another kingdom were, That the greater should rule and determine the causes of the less; and, according to the proportion thereof, to have subordinate standing courts erected to which, by appeal from one to the other, all causes should be brought: Whether were not these two, such differing frames of government; so as that he that would mould the first to the second, might not be chal-

lenged to set up a new government differing from the fundamental law of that kingdom? And, whether the first, is not a liberty to be stood upon, against the second, if it were vouchsafed to any kingdom?—and that is the case here!—is humbly submitted. And the bounds of such assemblies elective, need no set or standing rule; because they arise from emergent occasions, in cases of controversy and offence: and the extent of them, and so the condition and nature of the things themselves, do hold forth their own rise; like as the bounds of particular congregations, to be of such as live so as conveniently to meet in one place, ariseth from the nature of the thing itself and the necessary requisites thereunto.”^a

“REASONS against the argument drawn from the analogy of Matt. xviii.

“The strength of the argument runs, That because there should be this ‘remedy,’ that therefore there is such a remedy. It is granted, there is a remedy: which is, a going forth to other churches; which Acts xv. holds forth. But, that ‘excommunication,’—which is the remedy held forth, Matt. xviii.,—of the offending church or churches, should be the ‘remedy,’ is not there held forth, as hath been shown. There is remedy of co-ordination, such as between two nations, and as between *pares* as churches are; proceeding in a way suitable to their condition: but not this, of ‘subordination,’ that the greater number of churches should become standing courts, and have power to excommunicate the lesser; but, that all churches have a power to declare the offence, and withdraw communion from those churches. And in reason, how is it possible for a national church to excommunicate all the churches of a province? and how ineffectual would that be! Or, for a General Council to excommunicate a nation? And if they cannot use this ‘remedy,’ to what end is this ‘subordination of synods’ having this authority, pleaded for?

“i. And whereas it is said, That there must be the same remedy, that is, in a congregation, for an offending brother; or else, where the disease is strongest, the remedy is weakest. It is answered, first, that where the disease is strongest, there this which is called the strongest remedy cannot be applied; or with an apparent inefficaciousness. For, when the churches in a province err, or a national church; here the disease is strongest, and yet it would be in vain to interdict them communion among themselves, or ‘deliver’ them ‘unto Satan;’ 1 Cor. v. 5. Yea, when it comes to the highest, namely, a National Assembly, wherein—if erring—the disease is greatest and strongest, there is not only no ‘remedy,’ but the highest and greatest power to *do hurt* upon all under them! as when the generality of the clergy were Arians. And if they err, the error is worse than of a Pope’s erring, or a Bishop’s; he is but one, and may be deposed. And in the greater bodies of the clergy, the greater part are and have been still the worse and more corrupt; as is apparent in this kingdom at present; in which, by virtue of the Presbyterial principles, all ministers must be taken in: and if you will put them out, where will others be had in

^a P. 128—130

their room? Convert men, we cannot; and if not converted, ministers of all others are the worst, and greatest opposites to religion. And if a National Assembly be chosen by these, the greater number are like to be of the worst; and such as may alter all that you now have done!

“ And if it be said, That this will hold against great politic bodies as well, who may undo the commonwealth: the answer is, That the common and equal interest of all, and the common principles of preserving the rights and liberties of a state, and seeking the common good; is natural unto the generality of men: but the truths of the Gospel, and purity of religion and the power thereof; are contrary to the principles of all natural men. And in all ages, the most of the clergy have been aptest to corrupt the one and oppose the other. And in those ages, when such Councils began to be standing and in most credit, after the first three hundred years; then was it that the mystery of popery did work most powerfully, and those superstitions and corrupt opinions grew up which made way for ‘that man of sin,’ 2 Thes. ii. 3, and that body of popish doctrine that hath overspread the world. And if there should be no danger of corrupting the Truth, yet the churches, though Reformed, coming all out of popery and not being fully enlightened in all things, and the first notice of anything further in matters of theology usually falling into the hearts and spirits but of a few, we should have no further Truth taught, but oppressed, till a whole nation is [becomes] enlightened in it.

“ ii. The efficacy of all remedies doth depend, first, upon Christ’s blessing on them; which, depends upon his Institution of them: and par ratio, for ‘like reason,’ will never set up an ordinance, unless Christ hath himself appointed it; and in the example, Acts xv., there is not this way of proceeding held forth. Secondly, it lies in suitableness to the condition of those that are to be dealt with. Now, when many churches deal with an erring church; the churches in a province, with many erring churches; or of a nation, with a province; they must be in reason dealt with suitably to the condition of churches and of a multitude. And surely, a brotherly way of admonition, etc. [2 Thess. iii. 15]; withdrawing communion, [verse 14]; is more suitable unto such. As in the civil government, if a province rebels, or a great multitude of subjects; should the state presently hang up all in that province? although, unto particular persons rebelling, this is efficacious to suppress rebellion. Thirdly, Christ hath suited his remedies to all times, and unto all conditions; and, how national and provincial assemblies could be, during the first three hundred years, when yet churches were well governed, is submitted!

“ iii. And, lastly; If the analogy of this 18th of Matthew be argued; then, first, let the analogy be kept: and then, when a church hath offended other churches, they are not to bring them to a set court of judicature at first; for Christ’s rule is otherwise, in dealing with an offended brother; electively, to take two or three other churches, to admonish them,—which is more suited to that way forementioned, Acts xv. As for the proceedings against a brother, in a congregation;

there is not a set appointed number, of two or three standing persons to be the admonishers of all persons offending ere it comes to the church; nor have they power to excommunicate. And thus, by this proportion, instead of these set and standing provincial assemblies to whom causes are next brought, and these armed with power of excommunication; there should only be two or three or more neighbour churches to admonish the offending church; and not a standing court to bring it unto. And then, secondly, let it be shown where a standing 'synod' of elders is called The Church! And how, then, can the analogy hold, when it holds not in the name; 'Tell the Church?' The 'like reason' holds not, unless these Particular Congregations have the power of excommunication; for otherwise, if these greater assemblies' power be argued from the analogy of the lesser, and the same remedy excommunication, and the Particular Congregations have not that allowed them; then, by the principles of this analogy, it is nowhere to be found: but as the Congregational Churches have power only to admonish and suspend from sacraments, so the greater assemblies should have no more also. And though the Church Universal is called a Church, and 'one body' to Christ; yet as materially considered, and not as a politic body, in respect to government; which was never yet asserted by THIS ASSEMBLY."^a

Subscribed, as before, p. 494.

"REASONS against the Proposition touching Ordination: namely,

"It is very requisite, That no single congregation that can conveniently associate, do assume to itself all and sole power in Ordination."

"We offer these Reasons: i. Where there is a sufficient presbytery, 'all and sole power in Ordination' may be assumed, though association may be had: but there may be a sufficient presbytery in a particular congregation.

"The Major hath two parts; first, That a sufficient presbytery may 'assume all and sole power in ordination:' secondly, That it may do so, though it may 'associate.' The former is proved, 1 Tim. iv. 14, 'By the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,' as is voted by the Assembly; which is the only Scripture brought for Ordination by ordinary elders. The second part, appears, 1, Because association doth neither add to nor diminish the power of a presbytery: it is by way of accumulation, not privation; as is acknowledged by the Reformed Churches. 2, If association be so necessarily required, where it may be had; then, neither a classical, provincial, nor national presbytery, can 'assume all and sole power in ordination,' if there be any other classical, provincial, or national presbytery, with whom they may associate: and that there is, or may be, always some, is necessarily to be supposed in these times of the Gospel; if any association, ought to be.

"The Minor, That there may be a sufficient presbytery, in a particular congregation; is proved, 1, By the Second Proposition touching

^a P. 130—133.

Church Government, sent up to the Honourable Houses of Parliament, namely, 'A presbytery consists of ministers of the Word, and such other public officers as are agreeable to, and warranted by the Word of God, to be church-governors to join with the ministers in the government of the church:' all which, may be, in a particular congregation. 2, Wherein consists, The sufficiency of a presbytery? The number of how many elders, is not set or bounded by Institution: suppose two or three; and if more be requisite, in a particular congregation there may be four or five: and a presbytery over many congregations, is acknowledged to be sufficient though it consist of no more. If they have this power as a sufficient presbytery, why not the other also? Have they their power only as having relation to many congregations? Is that, the essential requisite to their sufficiency? Here are elders and as many elders, having relation to a church; and the argument used by the Reverend Assembly, to prove a presbytery over many congregations, is, That elders are mentioned in relation to one church!

"ii. That which two apostles, being joined together, might do in a particular congregation; that, ordinary elders may do in a particular congregation: but Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in particular congregations, though they might associate. Therefore, etc.

"The consequence appears thus, If the argument brought by the Rev. Assembly do hold, namely, That when the apostles met together for ordination; or for ordering the affairs of the church of Jerusalem; they met 'as ordinary elders;'—which they have voted:—then, surely, when Paul and Barnabas met to ordain elders in particular congregations, it is to be averred they met for that act 'as ordinary elders.'

"The Minor hath two parts, first, Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in particular congregations: secondly, That they might associate. First; That these were particular congregations, wherein they ordained elders, appears, Because it is not supposable that the cities, much less the regions round about, where the apostles preached and erected churches—as appears by Acts xiii. 49, compared with xiv. 6, 21—23,—were grown to many congregations before the apostles appointed elders to them: for the apostles, who were to preach in all places, would not stay so long in one place; and it was their course when they were there, *ἱκανοὶ*, as at Derbe, xiv. 21, to set elders to them. Again; this was the first ordination of elders to those places; and therefore, must needs be to particular congregations; for the classis, is made up of the elders of many congregations. Lastly; they ordained elders *κατ' ἐκκλησίαν* and *αὐτοῖς*, verse 23; and at their ordaining, they fasted and prayed, commending them to the grace of God: which fasting and praying, being—according to the principles of us both—to be in particular congregations; it followeth, that the 'churches' to which those elders were appointed, were particular congregations.

"For the second [part], That they might associate: it appears, Because there were churches in the regions round about, and yet the apostles mention not, association, which they would have done if that had been the way; for when they did things with ordinary elders, it

is thus recorded, 'The apostles and elders :' but they commend them to the grace of God, as Paul did the church of Ephesus, Acts xx. 32; as leaving sufficient means to perpetuate succession, and to ordain other elders if any should die, as also to build them up to eternal life."^a

Subscribed, as before, p. 494.

CHAP. LX.

LAUD'S EXECUTION.—BURTON'S "GRAND IMPOSTOR."

It is recorded in our pages, that the "two-handed engine" was made to perform its office on the first victim^b of a Triumvirate, whose extreme fate, as it does at this distance of time, so may ever continue to excite the best feelings of humanity. The second, is described, by no hostile hand, in terms not inapplicable to any one of the three :

"Mark'd out by dangerous parts, he meets the shock."^c

Concerning this one of whom we are now treating, we know not over which to lament the more, his injudicious friends or his unrelenting enemies,—they who dignify him under the style of "SAINT

^a P. 190—192.—We cannot withhold the extraordinary proem to the "Answer" of the Presbyterians on this Proposition, which had been introduced into the Assembly the first in order, but was the last disposed of : "Among all the Propositions which the Assembly presented to the Honourable Houses of Parliament concerning Ordination, our Brethren have singled out this one, to which they enter their Dissent; as if this alone were opposite to their opinions touching this matter. Which, whether it be so, or that there was not some other reason of their insisting on this rather than on any of the rest, themselves best know. We remember that in a Proposition not altogether unlike to this, some others of the Assembly differed somewhat in the debate from the *major* part : and we have observed our Brethren ready enough to take notice and make use of any such difference—although sometimes but in point of method ; as, whether of two propositions, this or that should be first debated ;—and to talk of a Third Party in the Assembly. We observe likewise, that the arguments here brought against this Proposition, are not properly arguments of their own [!], nor pressed by themselves in the Assembly, nor such as are most suitable to their own opinions ; [!] but arguments used by others in that debate. And whether that difference were not some reason why our Brethren chose rather to insist upon this Proposition in their Dissent than on some other, themselves are best able to determine. We expected from our Brethren—in a search for Truth, not a contest for Victory—arguments to prove 'That every single congregation,' &c. . . We must observe also of these borrowed arguments [!] brought by our Brethren against this Proposition, that neither of them concludes against the Proposition in debate." P. 185 [195]. The proceedings of the Erastians, as the "Third Party" in the Assembly, are stated and remarked upon by Neal, in the 6th chapter of the third volume of his History of the Puritans.

^b See back, p. 137.

^c "The Vanity of Human Wishes," by Sam. Johnson, LL.D. And see his opinion of Laud, in the Lives of Cheynel and Blake.

William," or they who, not contented with depressing him to the lowest deep, would find a lower still! Accordingly it has been applied to Laud what was said of another, "He entered like a fox, he reigned like a lion, and he died like a dog."^a On the contrary, neither did one blush to write of him,

"A death so full of merits, of such price,
To God and man so sweet a sacrifice,
As, by good Church-law, may his Name prefer
To a fixt Rubric in the Calendar.
And let this silence the Pure-sects' complaint—
If they make martyrs, we may make a Saint!

Rest thou, then, happy in the sweets of bliss,
Th' elysian—the Christian's—paradise,—
Exempt from worldly cares, secure from fears,
And let us have thy prayers [!] as thou our tears."^b

"Truly," says another, of the same external communion, "that must be an extraordinary Protestant Church in which Father Laud is accounted a martyr, and Father Heylyn a confessor!"^c

"On the tenth of January [1644-5]," writes W. Sanderson, "comes to the scaffold William Laud, D.D. etc. . . He was threatened for his life in March 1619[-20], the prologue to other libels and scandals, year by year, to *ann.* 1640; though the Scots' Remonstrance of their invasion heretofore, resolved then to ruin him. . . It had been put to the question in the Parliament, to ship him over for New England, there to expose him to the scorn of great professors.^d . . The fourth of January they passed their Ordinance of Parliament by both houses,^e to be drawn, hanged, and quartered, on Friday the tenth of January; the first man that ever suffered death by order of Parliament! On Tuesday before, he petitions the Lords to have his chaplain, Dr. Sterne, that worthy divine, 'admitted, to administer with him;' to alter the

^a "Hist. of the Church and State of Scotland, by Andrew Stevenson, 1753," 8vo. vol. i. p. 115.

^b An elegy on the Death of the Most Rev. Father in God, William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Jan. 10, 1644-5. See his Life by Heylyn, p. 546. "His death the more remarkable in falling on St. William's day." *Ibid.* p. 543.

^c "The Christian Observer, Mar. 1837," p. 176.

^d Laud says, in his Diary, p. 66—"Troubles, etc. 1695"—"March 24 [1642-3], Friday. One Mr. Foord told me,—he is a Suffolk man,—that there was a plot to send me and Bishop Wren as delinquents to New England, within fourteen days. And that Mr. Wells, a minister that came thence, offered wagers of it. The meeting was at Mr. Barks, a merchant's house in Friday-street, being this Foord's son-in-law. I never saw Mr. Foord before.—April 25, Tuesday. It was moved in the House of Commons to send me to New England: but it was rejected. The plot was laid by Peters, Wells, and others." Thus would the wheel of fortune of "the malicious Laud,"—so called by Archdeacon Blackburne, in "The Confessional," 1747, Pref. p. xxv.,—and of the transatlantic or New England divines, have turned the contrary way to Laud's own project in 1638, which was "to send a Bishop over to them, for their *better* government; and back him with some *forces* to compel, if he were not otherwise able to persuade, obedience!" Heylyn, p. 369.

^e "Whereof in the house of peers there were not above *twelve*:" Clarendon, Hist. Rebel. bk. viii. There were, however, *twenty* peers present: see the Lords' Journals, Jan. 4th. Vol. vii. p. 124, 125.

manner of his execution, and 'to be beheaded.' To which their Lordships willingly consented, and commended it to the Commons, but they would not. Only, in care of his soul, they would adjoin Mr. Marshall as more sufficient than the Doctor, and the Archbishop refused him. The Lords were very angry to be thus denied, and had much-ado to get their consent of beheading."^a

There are indeed who profess to be of the same communion with this self-deluded victim, among those who lay claim likewise to "apostolical succession," but whose ingenuous avowal proclaims their conviction that rank and learning are not, in all cases, accompanied by "meekness of wisdom:"^b these at least are not the Heylyns of their age; they say, nevertheless, "We abhor the injustice and tyranny of those who condemned Laud to *death*; but this must not blind us to his many and great offences. There can be no question but that he wished to subject the nation to civil and spiritual despotism; and, so little is forgiveness of injuries a natural virtue, that we cannot wonder that the victims of his severity—for he was the most influential and active member of the Star Chamber, and High Commission Court,—sought and found revenge; and that the nation, alarmed for the public liberties, made common cause with them."^c So far as "revenge" was sought for, we shrink not from avowing on our part, that the accusation can be but too well supported, and demands from us this declaration of our unfeigned abhorrence in whomsoever it is found; and fidelity requires us to say especially, that there is too much colour for charging the sin in its degree upon the production now to be noticed, but for which the provocation was the supreme folly of those who countenanced and strove to uphold, beyond what truth and justice required, unquestionably no common, but a great public delinquent. With these remarks we proceed to exhibit "The Grand Impostor Unmasked: Or, a Detection of the notorious Hypocrisy and desperate Impiety of the late Archbishop, so styled, of Canterbury; cunningly couched in that written Copy which he read on the Scaffold at his Execution, Jan. 10, 1644[-5,] *alias*, called by the Publisher, his 'Funeral Sermon.'—By Henry Burton.—Rom. ii. 5, 6. Psal. l. 21, 22.—'When the Fox preacheth, let the Geese beware!'—Published according to Order." No imprint of date. 4to. pp. 20.

The Preface begins thus, "Reader—The old saying is, 'Of the dead, speak nothing but well;' so shall I speak nothing but truth of this man's falsehood both while he lived and when he died. And let me deprecate thee the least suspicion of malice in me towards the man or his memory; the which I was so far and free from in his life-time that, a little before his death, myself with two other godly reverend brethren went to his lodging in the Tower to tender our christian duty of charity to him for counsel and comfort, if it would be accepted, in

^a "Complete Hist. of Charles I. 1658," fol. p. 780, 781.—Izaak Walton relates in his Life of Bishop Sanderson, edit. Zouch, 1796, 4to. p. 455, that "Many citizens fearing time and cool thoughts might procure his [Laud's] pardon, became so maliciously impudent as to shut up their shops, professing not to open them till justice was executed. This malice and madness is scarce credible, but I saw it."

^b Jas. iii. 13.

^c "The Christian Observer, June, 1837," p. 381.]

that his condition. But, by his secretary, he returning court-thanks, said some had been with him that day, and now he was otherwise employed in his private business: whereupon, we returned.^a And, that morning, Mr. Lieutenant of the Tower having been with him, and taking his leave with these words, 'I pray God open your eyes;' he returned him thanks, saying, 'And I pray God open your eyes; and I hope there is no harm in that:' by which, he would cunningly insinuate that Master Lieutenant's eyes were blinded rather than his. But more of this legerdemain anon. And for this task, I was first earnestly importuned, by two reverend godly ministers, to undertake it; which I took as a call from God. Now, for his 'Funeral Sermon,' how it could be truly said to be preacht when he read it verbatim; as also, how he could properly be said to pray what he read in his paper—for without his book, he could neither preach nor pray—I leave to thy right judgment. Finally; that such a poisonful piece as this, should be so licentiously published in print before some antidote were prepared either to correct its malignancy or to corroborate the simple-hearted people, apt to drink in such a sugared potion from the mouth of such a bold dying man, though a traitor; if understanding men do not wonder, I shall confess myself the only fool to marvel: but I hope this antidote will not come altogether too late to recover such as whose weaker stomachs have not been able to overcome the poison.—Farewell."

The tract itself opens with Laud's words. " 'Good people—You will pardon my old memory, and upon so sad occasions as I am come to this place, to make use of my papers; I dare not trust myself otherwise.'^b

"However the 'good people' may 'pardon' his 'old memory' for reading instead of preaching; yet how the righteous God should pardon

^a "That servant of the Lord, with two more who, in a dear affection to his departing soul, went to visit him, could not be admitted. Dr. Heywood, Dr. Martin, and Dr. Sterne, were the men with whom he craved leave to advise; for *they* would *absolve* him after their manner and like to like!... I was an ear-witness how effectually the dying man's Sermon, as we call it, wrought upon the hearers who counted themselves discreet men. But sure I am, in such a concourse of people the greatest number are not so discreet! And for their sakes, as I have set down his doings, so shall I his sayings, that the reader, with me may ponder them together... I know some looked upon him as the saddest object that ever they beheld: and truly I think myself was one. And some looked upon him as a humble penitent, for no other reason but because he said so; and so they were infinitely mistaken!" p. 8, 11, of "The Life and Death of William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury; beheaded on Tower-hill, Friday the 10th of Jan., 1644[-5]. I. Here is a brief Narrative of his Doings all his life long, faithfully given out first, that his Sayings at his death may not be a snare to the perdition of souls. II. His Doings and Sayings being compared and weighed together, his Sayings are found infinitely too light; yet of weight sufficient to press any man to make a threefold Use from all, of infinite concernment to his eternal soul. By E. W., who was acquainted with his proceedings at Oxford; was an eye and ear witness of his Doings and Sayings in his Courts here at London and other places under his Dominion.—Rev. ix. 20, 21, 'Yet repented not,' &c. Prov. xxviii. 15.—1645." 4to. pp. 42.

^b Heylyn says the speech was "spoken;" and he has dropped the next words after the compellation, "Good people." But Burton followed "The Archbishop of Canterbury's Speech: Or, His Funeral Sermon, preacht by Himself on the

such an 'old memory' as could not remember one of all those gross sins wherein he had lived, so as to confess them, and to crave pardon of God for them, I cannot see... Yea, when Mr. Weld, Mrs. Jones, and others, came to him in the Tower, to demand of him recompense for all the wrongs he had done them in their persons, credits, and estates, he could never be brought to acknowledge the least; saying, he remembered no such thing: thus laying all the burden upon his 'old memory,' living and dying...

"He calls the scaffold 'an uncomfortable' place to 'preach' in: but sure...the martyrs did not so, who, coming to the stake cheerfully, saluted it with a kiss. And could not his 'old memory' have remembered that pillory-suffering, not much above seven years' standing, which his conscience at least might have suggested unto him how a certain quondam preacher standing in the pillory, pleasantly said, 'I never preacht in such a pulpit before;' saying also to the people, and that with a repetition for their remembrance, 'Little do you know what fruit God is able to produce out of this dry tree:' making the pillory, all the while, his triumphal chariot,^a while that Canterburian Prelate together with Con the Pope's nuncio, and other compeers, was a triumphant spectator out of the Star Chamber.^b He little dreamed then, that such a pillory could in the space of seven years, grow to such a bulk as whereof to hew out and erect a scaffold on the Tower-hill, where himself should lose his head for others' ears!...

"Well, he takes his text: Heb. xii. 1, 2. 'Let us run,' etc. Miserable man! never was a holy text so unhallowed; so miserably abused, so corruptly glossed upon, so shamefully perverted; as this text... Surely, this man, in his 'race,' had often an eye unto 'Jesus!' that is, to the *name* 'Jesus,' whereof he was a very devout adorer; and so zealous that he suspended me once, for preaching against the superstitious bowing at the naming of that Name... By this time, himself knows sufficiently, with what eye he looked 'unto Jesus' as whom he finds a just judge; and punisher of that faith of his, which was none other but that of Babylon, as the reader may see at large in my Reply^c to his 'Relation of a Conference.' That he is now come to the end of his 'race,' though 'long,' we bless God.

"But here, he finds the Cross 'a death of shame:'... the 'cross' which he so honoured and adored in his life; witness, the goodly

Scaffold on Tower-hill, on Friday the 10th of Jan. 1644[-5], upon Heb. xii. 1, 2. Also, the Prayers which he made at the same time and place before his Execution. All faithfully written by John Hinde whom the Archbishop beseeched that he would not let any wrong be done him by any phrase in false Copies.—Licensed and Entered according to Order.—1644[-5]." 4to. pp. 19.

^a See back, vol. i. p. 567.

^b *Ibid*, p. 566.

^c P. 166—170, 173, of "A Reply to 'A Relation of the Conference' between William Laud and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit. By a Witness of Jesus Christ. Imprinted anno 1640." 4to. pp. 405.—"The emulation that, under the old Law, was in the King towards the Priest, is now so come about in the Gospel, that all the danger is to be feared from the Priest to the King. Whilst the priest's office in the Law, was set out with an exterior lustre of pomp and glory, kings were ambitious to be priests; now priests,—not perceiving the heavenly brightness and inward splendour of their more glorious Evangelic ministry,—with as great ambition, affect to be kings; as in all their courses, is easy to be observed, .. Have not

crucifix over his altar at Lambeth, Whitehall, and elsewhere, which he was not wont to pass by unsaluted! 'But the shame must be despised, or there is no coming to the right hand of God:' how! must that shame be 'despised,' which the righteous hand of God brought him unto? . . . Why did he petition the Lords, that he might not die the more shameful death of the halter, but rather of the hatchet, as more suitable for one who had sat so long and oft at those *late* 'honourable boards,' as also in the present parliament? . . . But . . . he adds, 'God forbid, I should despise the shame for Him:' what! a 'shame' suffered for Christ? . . . Christ is said to despise the shame, by a voluntary undergoing it in our steads; but this man despiseth the shame, by a desperate contempt in suffering it perforce, against his will!

"He tells us, his 'feet are now upon the brink of the Red sea; an argument,' he hopes, that God was bringing him 'to the land of promise.' . . . No good 'argument' for him, to hope to pass that way to Canaan, . . . for causing so much blood to be shed, and more especially of that poor soul who was hanged, drawn, and quartered,^a about the business of Lambeth-house! . . .

"He compares himself with Aaron, as before with Christ; but he must remember he is no longer the Canterburian 'high priest.' But, who be those 'Egyptians' that drove this Aaron into the Red sea, and must be 'drowned in the same waters?' O, full of subtlety; what! the Parliament? . . .

"And here, he compares himself with those three children in the 'furnace,' whence God delivered them, and so can he *him*. Miserable prelate: is he now upon the scaffold for such a cause as those were in the 'furnace'? Why, those were there for 'not' obeying the King's commandment to bow to his new 'golden god;'^b but was this bishop now on the scaffold for any such disobedience: nay, was it not for his too much officiousness and obedience? . . . 'They would not worship the King's golden *image*; nor will I,' saith he, 'the *imaginations* which the People are setting up: nor will I forsake the temple and the truth of God, to follow the bleating of Jeroboam's calves in Dan and in Bethel.'^c By 'people' here, he must needs mean the Parliament; . . . and so, by 'Jeroboam's calves,' whereby he means a revolting from Judah and from true religion; and, that the Religion now to be set up is, in comparison of that under the Prelacy, no better than Jeroboam's calves worshipped in Bethel and Dan; and the prelatical government, as the temple of Jerusalem and the truth of God! Thus he holds to his old principles, which he sucked in with his mother's milk and was nourished up in [at] Oxford, and which grew up with him in Court to a full stature. But stay; shall he 'run' away with it thus in a dark mist: leaving the 'people' to grope at noon-day, as in the Egyptian

some of their devoted scholars begun, I need not say to nibble, but openly to argue, against the King's supremacy? Is not the Chief of them accused out of his own Book, and his late Canons, to affect a certain unquestionable Patriarchate, independent, and unsubordinate to the crown?" Milton: "Of Reformation in England," 1641. Prose Works, edit. 1833. *imp.* 4to. p. 16.

^a May 21st, 1640. See back, p. 49. ^b Dan. iii. 18. ^c 1 Kings xii.

darkness? . . Will he interest and engage Christ in all his idolatrous crucifixes, crosses, altars, superstitious worship, ceremonies, and relics of Rome, set up everywhere in his idol temples and chapels, calling all this his 'temple' and [the] 'truth of God?' . . And doth this devout votary to images, 'humbly thank' Christ, that his 'resolution' lay, not to lie down till he laid down his head upon the block; not to part with his Antichristian Hierarchy, the grand enemy of Christ's kingdom: and [a] grievous tyranny over the souls and bodies of Christ's saints, whose redemption cost him his dearest blood? . .

"He bestows his episcopal blessing upon the 'people,' for the opening of 'their eyes' to see 'the right way:' himself being so blind as not to see any other 'right way' out of his own way! . . But he acknowledgeth himself, 'in all humility, a most grievous sinner many ways, by thought, word, and deed; and therefore I doubt not,' saith he, 'but that God hath mercy in store for me a poor penitent, as well as for other sinners:' but, wherein; what sin; what thought; what word; what deed! did he confess those thoughts whereby he resolved and endeavoured to reconcile Rome and England together, which he expressed in his 'Relation of a Conference' with the Jesuit? Did he confess the sinful words of that reconciling book? that there, he cunningly incites the king against godly ministers? that there, he 'blames and bewails, with a bleeding heart, the separation between Protestants and Papists, both for the causing and continuing of it?'^a that he hath there, in many passages, abused and vilified the Scriptures all along his book? that he hath fathered his gross lies upon God the Father, upon Christ, upon the Holy Ghost?^b And infinite other bold and wicked expressions there. And for his deeds; did he ever confess elsewhere, or on the scaffold, all his prelatical pranks and practices in oppressing, suppressing, supplanting, the 'truth of God,' both in pulpit and press; silencing, suspending, fining, confining, outing, godly painful preachers, with wives, children, and other Christians? Did he ever confess his being the chief cause of cropping of ears, pillorying, imprisoning, whipping, branding, banishing those against whom no crime could be laid by any law? Or, did he, to show the truth of conversion, come forth to offer restitution to all that he had wronged, oppressed, and spoiled of their goods and livelihoods? No such thing; here is nothing but a general confession of, I know not what, 'grievous sins!' . . Augustine saith, 'The sin is not pardoned, where the wrong is not satisfied for.' . .

"What have we to do with his self-deceiving 'heart,' known only to God? We look upon his actions; we judge of the tree by the fruits. He finds not in his false 'heart' any true cause of 'death:' but we find it in his hands. . . But however, he chargeth nothing upon his 'judges:' that is well; for never had traitor fairer play; and they proceeded *secundum allegata et probata*. . . And though, in a legal course, an 'innocent' may be condemned, yet more nocents are; which he was to have looked better to. But, for all this, he thanks Christ, he is 'quiet within, as ever.' . .

"Among others, his 'predecessors,' as he calls them, he brings in

^a Reply, p. 19, 252, 225.

^b *Ibid.* p. 205, 202, 275, 211.

‘St. John Baptist,’ as he styles him, whose head was ‘danced off’ by a lewd woman:’ and surely, if he had been as faithful as John Baptist was in reprovng Herod and his lewd woman, he might, perhaps, have been prevented of losing his [own] head for treason; and might have proved a ‘Saint’ William for it! . . .

“But it ‘comforts’ him, that his ‘charge looks somewhat like that of St. Paul, Acts xxv. 8, being accused for law and religion; and, that of Stephen, Acts vi. 13, 14:’ a poor comfort when well considered, and the account cast up. . . This Prelate could not say, he persecuted the saints ‘ignorantly.’ . . .^a

“Here he, as impertinently as before, hales in another place of Scripture, and that most grossly! ‘The Romans will come, if we let this man alone.’^b Surely, he hath pretty well played *his* part to bring the *Romans* in! . . . so as, no marvel it is if, by the industry of this man, . . . the Pope never had such a harvest in England, [since the Reformation.] . . . So that Popery is that grand ‘sect,’ the *grandam* of all divisions; especially of this great one between King and Kingdom. . . But his aim was against godly people, whom, separating from his own hierarchy, he brands with ‘sects and divisions!’ . . . And as for that place, 2 Cor. vi. 8, . . . his ‘honour,’ is dishonour; his ‘good report,’ evil; and this ‘deceiver,’ is truly so, living and dying.

“Next, he tells us what a good ‘Protestant’ the King is: . . . what good counsel he hath given him, both his practices and his Epistle dedicatory, before his ‘Relation,’ besides his ‘conscience,’ can tell.

“He complains of the City, for that ‘fashion’ in gathering of ‘hands,’ and going to the Parliament to ‘clamour for justice;’ as being a disparagement to that great and just court: a way to ‘endanger’ the ‘innocent,’ and ‘pluck’ innocent blood upon ‘their own’ and city’s ‘heads!’ . . . As if any such ‘clamour’ should extort from them any act of injustice, as thereby to condemn the innocent!’ . . . Certainly, in calling for ‘justice,’ not only of God, but of man who sits in God’s throne for that end, is the People’s duty who ought to obey God, rather than a Prelate who is so unreasonably partial in his own cause. . . Psalm ix. 12, and Heb. x. 31, he miserably applies. . . Had not both Parliament and People bestirred themselves . . . he had been too nimble for us all: but God, I say, was pleased to use the industry of his people to find out this fox’s holes! But besides all this, Oh the impudency of this wretched man in commending to ‘this city’ the consideration of that prophecy, Jer. xxvi. 15: . . . they are the words of the prophet Jeremiah to the princes of Judah and Jerusalem. . . Whether he spake [the words, the place only being quoted] on the scaffold I know not, for I was not there. . . Could this man possibly believe that any in this City should be so simple as to believe him? . . .

“Here this porcupine strikes himself through with his own quills: he complains for ‘the poor Church of England,’—and that is his hierarchy, . . . [that at] ‘every cleft’ of this self-divided kingdom, ‘profaneness and irreligion’ have crept in. Now, truly, himself was the prime wood-cleaver that drave in the first ‘wedges.’^c . . . But stay, what

^a 1 Tim. i. 13.

^b John xi. 48.

^c “It is become like an oak cleft to shivers with wedges made out of its own body.” Life, by Heylyn, p. 533.

means this ‘profaneness and irreligion?’ . . . He shall be his own interpreter. In his ‘Relation,’ he tells the King, ‘Though I cannot prophesy, yet I fear that atheism and irreligion gather strength, while the truth is thus weakened by an unworthy way of contending.’^a And, ‘The external worship of God, in his church, is the great witness to the world that our hearts stand right in the service of God: Take this away, or bring it into contempt, and what light is there left to shine before men, that they may see our devotion, and glorify our Father which is in heaven?’^b The result is, as the Replier cleareth, that the neglect or contempt of his ‘external’ worship, is that which bringeth in ‘profaneness and irreligion;’ that is, ‘*not* to set the face in a right posture towards the east, in our devotion; *not* to bow to an altar; *not* to kneel at the sacrament; *not* to use a fair white surplice and black hood in administration; *not* to baptize with the sign of the cross; *not* to say second service, etc.’^c All this, shows that our hearts stand *not* right in the service of God; that without these, no ‘light is left to shine before men, that they may see our devotion, and glorify our Father which is in heaven!’ Oh! notorious hypocrisy; oh! egregious impiety, thus to abuse Scripture, and all true religion. Prosper’s speech, here alleged by him, hits him[self] full home: ‘Men that introduce profaneness’—which is done by a false religion and devotion, of man’s devising,—‘are cloaked with a name of imaginary religion.’^d And what is imagery in worship, but an ‘imaginary religion?’ . . .

“He makes a solemn protestation of his religion to be ‘Protestant;’ but with this limitation, in reference to the Church of England only; not to other Protestant churches; for no Protestant churches are Episcopal but this. . . . He disclaims the bringing in of Popery into this land: now, what should be the meaning of this mystery, considering all his endeavours and practices have tended and contended to reduce this his church to as near a conformity with Rome as possibly may be? For, excepting the differences in doctrine, take the whole hierarchy—government, discipline, officers, services, ceremonies, vestments, and all other implements;—we find the Church of England to be one and the same with that of Rome, as the Prelate affirmeth.^e How, then, is it true that he is no setter up or bringer in of Popery, as he protesteth? Surely, two ways: first, because he found some old relics of Rome in the King’s chapels^f and some cathedrals, as an altar, images, adorations, organ-service, copes, and the like.^g Therefore, he makes a shift by piecing it out with some forced interpretations of the Queen’s ‘Injunctions,’ [Elizabeth’s], and with improvement of the Service-book, and other *viis et modis*, to bring in a general Conformity to those patterns; and that, under a specious colour of ‘Uniformity:’ a very Laud-able thing in a kingdom; especially *Regis ad exemplum*, that all should be of the King’s religion, or the religion of his chapel. . . . And thus all being raised up to one Conformity, it came to pass that both Jesuits, on the one side, boasted that the Church of England

^a Ep. Ded.^b Relation, p. 18, 19.^c Burton’s “Reply to A Relation, &c.” p. 37, 38.^d ‘Religionis imaginariæ.’ De Vitæ Contemptu, lib. ii. cap. iv.^e “See my Reply, p. 63—69.” ^f Amos vii. 13. ^g Relation, Ep. Ded. p. 16.

was turned Roman, and some bold Ministers began to tell tales in the pulpit, and at last to write and publish books of it, though to their cost. This is the golden leaf wherewith the Prelate hath gilded over his protestation for current; for which he flies and lays hold on the horns of the altar in the King's chapel; his most sacred sanctuary! His other [way], is a word of equivocation, which is 'Popery:' he distinguisheth Popery into proper, and improper or less proper. Popery, taken properly, is that whereof the Pope is sole head and master; and this is that Popery which he here protesteth he never intended or endeavoured to set up in the Church of England; to wit, the universal headship of the Pope, which the logicians call *proprium quarto modo*, that is, such as is proper to the Pope, and only to the Pope, and always to the Pope, as laughing is said to be proper to man, alone, and at all times! The Prelate then, would not have such a Popery set up, in the *propriety* of it, as should exalt the Pope over the See of Canterbury to overtop the 'Metropolitan of all England!' What then? he would have no other Popery set up, in England, than that only which is less proper, or improperly called Popery; or rather, a thing that is Popery, but must not be called Popery: and that is, that the Pope shall be head or Bishop of the Church of Rome, and the Archbishop of Canterbury shall be an independent Primate and 'Metropolitan of all England;' and the Pope to have nothing to do here, but himself alone to be *Dominus factotum*! Only with this reserve, That this Primate becomes Pope, when time serves. And it seems, he takes it as a deed of gift from the Pope which he gave to the Prelate's predecessor, Anselm, to whom the Pope gave this title, styling him 'Patriarcha alterius orbis,' the Patriarch, or Pope, of the other world, meaning England; of which the Roman poet writ of old,

' Et penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos.'

And thus, it seems, it descended upon the successors of Canterbury, by an hereditary right, from the Pope: and, therefore, not without cause doth the Prelate make mention hereof, in his 'Relation,'^a telling us that a Patriarch is above a Primate, so expert was he in the learning of ecclesiastical heraldry for titles and degrees.^b And thus, we come to understand what he means by making profession of the 'Protestant' religion of the Church of England; namely, that this religion is not Popery, properly taken, but only improperly; as hath been said: so as herein, we may give credit to his words in some sense; both for himself and his friends whom he so highly magnifies for 'good Protestants of the Church of England.' This is that 'true Protestant religion' which they so much protest, by hook or crook, to maintain.

"Touching his 'Treason,' in subverting the laws and perverting of religion; it matters not, for all his protestations, that he never intended, but ever 'abhorred' it! For all things were clearly and fully proved in Court against him. . . For his contempt of Parliaments; this was also proved against him; and he here, in part, confesseth it.^c And, in

^a P. 171.

^b See Burton's "Reply," p. 263, 264.

^c "Of some Parliaments." Life, by Heylyn, p. 534.—How he treated Parlia-

the close, he forgives 'all the world:' he cries thief first, calling all his persecutors his 'bitter enemies;' he forgives them, he saith, but he gives them a cruel dash, calling them 'bitter enemies' who did but in a legal way and just cause prosecute him as a grand enemy both to religion and to the republic: therefore, what kind of forgiveness this is, God knows, when it so ends in a most bitter calumny! . . . He asks forgiveness of every man, 'whether he hath offended him or not:' why? what need of forgiveness, where no offence, given or taken? But, saith he, 'if he do but conceive that I have!' . . . What say you to that speech of his in his 'Relation,' to the King, 'God forbid, I should ever offer to persuade a persecution in any kind, or practise it in the least!' It is but a conceit, then, that the Prelate of Canterbury should be either a 'persecutor or a persuader' thereunto! A conceit, that he should persuade that the terrible censure in the Star Chamber, against those his three 'bitter' men, as he calls them, should be executed to the uttermost, although he left them to the King's 'justice!'^a A conceit, that he should use the least means to *promerit* the Judges a little before the Censure; though he made a great feast at Lambeth! A conceit, that *he* should be an instrument of persecution to whom poor petitioners to the King, about the Book of Sports, were referred for mercy; while none could be had, or hoped for! And thus he concludes, 'Lord, do thou forgive me, and I beg forgiveness of him:' of whom? of one, 'whether I have offended him or not, if he do but conceive that I have!' what juggling is here! no spark of ingenuity or truth in all this, nor all along. Well, but what then? so, saith he, 'I heartily desire you to join with me in prayer.'

"He should have remembered that saying of Christ, Matt. v. 23—25. Now the Prelate here brings his 'gift' to the 'altar;' he hath a prayer in his hand, instead of his heart, to 'offer:' but he should remember that not one 'brother' but many, have great and grievous things 'against' him. Therefore, before he read his prayer, he should have rubbed up his 'old' rusty 'memory' and called for those who had many things 'against' him, and have made his peace with them. He should have called for all those preachers whom he had wickedly and prelatically suspended, silenced, deprived, thrust out of their means, with their wives and children exposed to beggary and misery! Among many others, Mr. Rudd, of Abingdon; Mr. [Nathaniel] Bernard; Mr. Forbes; Mr. [Samuel] Ward; etc. He should have called for

ments is thus acknowledged; how he was repaid by one, himself shall be the witness; for in chap. 21 of his Troubles and Trials, p. 217, he tells posterity, "My hopes under God, were upon the Lords, yet, when my trial did come on, it did somewhat trouble me to see so few Lords in that great House; for at the greatest presence that was any day of my hearing, there were not above fourteen, and usually not above eleven or twelve. Of these, one third part at least, each day took or had occasion to be gone before the charge of the day was half given. I never had, any one day, the same Lords all present at my defence in the afternoon, that were at my charge in the morning. Some leading Lords were scarce present at my charge four days of all my long trial, nor three at my defence; and what is most, no one Lord was present at my whole trial, but the Right Honourable the Lord Gray of Wark, the Speaker, without whose presence it could not be a House!"

^a See back, vol. i. p. 588, note¹

all those godly preachers and Christians whom his bloody cruelty caused to flee into the deserts of America, as Mr. Cotton, Mr. Hooker, Mr. Davenport, Mr. Peters, with many thousands more. He should have called for all those congregations whose souls he famished by taking away their godly teachers, 'the blood' of whose 'souls' were found to be upon *his* 'skirts' and under his wings!^a He should have called for all those whom he had, most cruelly and against all justice, caused to be imprisoned, pilloried, ear-cropped, branded, whipped, fined; confined to perpetual close imprisonment, and that in perpetual banishment from their native country, from society of wives, children, friends, acquaintance, common light and air; and what not? as Mr. William Prynne, Dr. Bastwick, Henry Burton, Dr. Leighton, Mr. John Lilburne, Nathaniel Wickins; all which with many more, endured intolerable, inhuman, and most barbarous usage in their prisons and persons. These; these, should he have called for to have made his peace with them, by at least acknowledging his extreme wronging of them as having been the prime instrumental cause thereof; though otherwise, he could never make them restitution for their ears nor satisfaction for their losses. . . He should have put it past 'if' and 'and,' whether he had 'offended' any, or not, as if any did 'but conceive' so! . . He persists . . acknowledging not the least offence to man, in all his life, of which to repent; hoping thereby after his death to merit this inscription upon his tomb,

HERE LIES THE MOST INNOCENT ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

"But now, can he not be content to die in his own sins, but he must 'heartily desire' the people 'to join' with him in his most hypocritical, dead, lame, blind prayer, that he brought with him in his hand. . . There are some passages in it so gross and palpable as [that] any one that hath the least spark of God's Spirit, may discover plainly to be monstrous false: as, first, that *he hath* a heart ready to die 'for God's honour';^b and yet he will not confess any one particular wickedness, that he might, with Achan, 'give glory to God.'^c Secondly; 'for the King's happiness:' when, if either he counselled the King to all these courses so destructive both to himself and kingdom; or if he, by obeying the King's command in being an active instrument of all those cruel oppressions, perpetrated by him upon the innocent Subjects; and exorbitant, illegal, violent, tyrannical invasions upon the just laws of the kingdom and natural liberties of the Subject; be thus, by the laws of the kingdom and a due proceeding therein, brought to this just penal death; surely, this can little make for the King's 'happiness:' unless the cutting off of such limbs as these, and so of this active instrument of wickedness in particular, may be a means to procure the King's 'happiness,' in case such heads so cut off prove not the heads of the Roman hydra, which, upon the cutting off of one head, puts forth two, until the whole Lerna-lake shall be quite drained and

^a Jer. ii. 34.

^b "Give me now . . a heart ready," etc. See Heylyn, *sup.* p. 535.

^c Josh. vii. 19, 20.

dried up : otherwise he, whose whole life hath but a little advanced the King's 'happiness,' can give but little hope of raising it by such a death, the just reward of a traitor. Thirdly ; for 'this church's preservation : ' by which, he always understands his hierarchy, or 'the Protestant religion of the Church of England,' as before : there cannot be a more sure omen of the utter ruin of that, as whose Primate is so cut off by the hatchet of justice in the hangman's hand.

"Again : he boldly tells God that his 'zeal' to these three, 'is all the sin which' he knows 'is yet known' of him 'in this particular of treason : ' did his 'zeal,' then, so far transport him as to wade so deep through so many acts of treason to the State as to play the traitor for the 'honour' of God ? Surely, God will not be honoured with any such service. And as for his 'zeal' to the King's 'happiness,' no marvel if it were so fiery as to [make him] become an incendiary to the State ; and all, for the 'preservation' of this his Church, which could not be preserved but with the extreme hazard, if not utter ruin, of three kingdoms ! So as such a 'preservation' purchased at so dear a rate, could be as little for the King's 'honour' as for his 'happiness,' when three kingdoms should rather welter in their own blood than the Prelatical-kingdom should not wallow in all its pomp and pleasure. And indeed, the 'zeal' hereof, in all ages, hath been that which hath set the kingdoms of the earth in such horrible combustions as at length it hath grown to be a proverb of the Prelates' own making, 'No bishop, no king ;' and so, No bishopric or bishopdom, no kingdom !

"He prays also, that 'there may be a stop of that issue of blood in this more than miserable kingdom : ' here it may be questioned, what he means by this 'issue of blood ?' If he mean the stopping of the course of justice in cutting off such traitors as himself ; this, is to pray that this 'more than miserable' kingdom may be made more than most miserable. If he mean the stopping of the now issue of blood that is, and hath been, shed by this intestine and unnatural war ; whereby the 'Beast's' power seeks to destroy the 'Lamb's' kingdom, with his 'called, and chosen, and faithful' people ;^a this, should extremely aggravate and make the sin of this Prelate out of measure sinful, as who hath been one prime instrument and bloody agent to procure all this bloodshed.

"But that which followeth, surpasseth all transcendency of the malice and wickedness of hell itself : 'I shall desire,' saith he, 'that I may pray for the people too, as well as for myself : O Lord, I beseech thee give grace of repentance to all people that have a thirst for blood ; but if they will not repent, then scatter their devices,' etc. : here, first, he makes it plain that what he prayed before was for himself and his party, and that the 'issue of blood' on his part might be stopped, as before. Secondly ; the main of his prayer is to lay the guilt of all the blood, that hath been shed in this war, upon the Parliament and people ; especially this City, that stand for their rights, as a 'people' that 'thirst for blood ;' whereof if they 'repent not' that then 'their devices' may be scattered, as being contrary to God's 'glory, the truth and sincerity of religion,' to wit, of Popery, as before showed ; to 'the establishment of the King and his posterity after him in their just

^a Rev. xvii. 14.

rights and privileges,' to wit, in an arbitrary and tyrannical government, whereby the tyrannical Prelacy, 'the truth and sincerity' of the Popish 'religion,' may be supported and maintained: for which very cause all this bloody war hath been raised and continued in Ireland and England, wherein so many hundred thousands of innocent people and loyal Subjects have been most barbarously murdered; and for no other cause but that they bare the name of Protestants; only not such Protestants as could be hoped to profess the 'true Protestant religion of the present Church of England;' the 'truth and sincerity' of which 'religion,' is Popery improperly so called, as before is showed.

"But he adds, 'for, the honour and conservation of Parliaments in their ancient and just power:' note here; never a prayer, in particular, for this present Parliament; but for 'parliaments' in general, and that also with a limitation, 'in their ancient and just power!' And what is that? namely, so far as standeth with the 'King's prerogative;' according to that new clause lately foisted into the King's oath at his coronation by the legerdemain of this juggler—'to govern his People according to the laws, and maintain their rights and liberties,' but with this proviso, 'so far as stands with the King's prerogative!'—which legerdemain was one of those charges proved against the Prelate in the Honourable House of Peers: so as in these words 'ancient and just power,' do lurk a great deal of serpentine deceit; that all this 'ancient and just power' comes to 'just' nothing, further than with reference unto and dependence upon the 'King's prerogative!' Such are the sly equivocations and mental reservations of this subtle serpent all along in this his pretended Prayer, wherein he thus desperately dallieth with God and men.

"Then, 'for, the preservation of this poor Church in her truth, peace, and patrimony:' this 'poor church;' to wit, the late and yet proud Prelacy. Her 'truth,' such as is regulated by her Canons with an 'et cætera:'^a her 'peace,' for which she hath caused troubles and wars in these kingdoms: her 'patrimony,' a part of 'Peter's patri-

^a "Mr. Le Bas [in his *Life of Laud*, 1836, 16mo.] has told us that 'the insane and wicked outcry' against the 'et cætera' oath 'was purely the dictate of malignity and faction!' Could this excellent churchman find no softer words to characterize the conduct and motives of Bishop Sanderson, who was one of those who 'cried out' against its iniquity? But Mr. Le Bas is too good an advocate to think of qualifying his expressions, when lightness of reason is to be compensated with weight of words. The Dedication of Laud's Speech upon the Sentence of Bastwick, Prynne, and Burton, [See back, vol. i. p. 576], is one of the most undignified effusions which ever came from a Christian prelate." *The Christian Examiner*, and *Church of Ireland Magazine*, Feb. 1837: quoted in "*The Christian Observer*," *sup.* p. 381. In this latter publication, Le Bas' production is described as "in truth, a decidedly party-spirited and historically unjust work." P. 383. One of those who took a part in the alleged "insane cry" has left his record that "the tyrant of Canterbury provided a sorrowful cup for the saints. He drove his flock, and called his goats together: themselves constituted ungodly Oaths and sinful Canons to confirm their designs; and their silken doctors labour to establish them, whose readiness and diligence was as if they soared on eagles' wings to perfect the same; whilst good and godly men wept and bewailed the calamities we then groaned under." Page [5] of "*Canterbury's Pilgrimage: In the Testimony of an accused Conscience, for the blood of Mr. Burton, Mr. Prynne, and Dr. Bastwick*. And the just, deserved Sufferings he lies under: Showing the

mony' for the support of her 'truth, and peace;' that which this Prelate, in his 'Relation of a Conference,' took all that pains about, for the 'blessed meeting of Truth and Peace,' as he calls it, in reconciling Rome and England together; as he professeth throughout his book, and in the very last page and words thereof. He adds, 'and, the settlement of this distracted and distressed people,' etc.: whatsoever he prays here, is with reference to the 'truth, peace, and patrimony,' of his 'poor Church;' and therefore, it is added with a copulative, 'and, the settlement,' etc.

"And hereunto, he adds another 'and:' 'and, when all this is done,' that then 'they may be thankful, with religious, dutiful obedience to Thee and thy commandments:' here, they must take notice that there is no such blessing, for which to be thankful, as the upholding of the Prelate's Protestant religion; 'when this is done, then fill their hearts with thankfulness.' But, how can 'dutiful obedience to God's commandments' and to Prelatical canonical commandments, stand together? For, what more contrary? . . .

"He closes all with a 'Lord, receive my soul to mercy;' adding, 'Our Father, etc.' Now, what hath an impenitent, hard-hearted hypocrite, to do with 'mercy?' . . . The 'Reply to the Relation,' hath set him forth in his colours long before; prophesying of his cursed end, which we see now fulfilled; as also, of the terrible judgments and calamities that should fall upon his Prelatical Clergy of England,

Glory of Reformation above Prelatical Tyranny. Wherein is laid open the Reality of the Scottish Nation with the Kingdom of England.—Printed for H. Walker, 1641." 4to. pp. [6].

Allusion being made also in the text above, to these Canons of 1640; in addition to Clarendon's implied condemnation of them, or rather of their legality, which we have given in this volume, p. 50, we are here able to show how Laud himself, under his own hand, quailed at the consequence of his and his fellows' temerity:—"To my much honoured Friend, Mr. John Seldon, These, *Sal. in Christo*. Worthy Sir, I understand that the business about the late Canons will be handled again in your House to-morrow. I shall never ask any unworthy thing of you, but give me leave to say as follows: If we have erred in any point of legality unknown to us, we shall be heartily sorry for it, and hope that error shall not be made a crime. We hear that Ship-money is laid aside as a thing that will die of itself, and I am glad that it will have so quiet a death. May not these unfortunate Canons be suffered to die as quietly without blemishing the Church, which hath so many enemies both at home and abroad? If this may be, I here promise you, I will presently humbly beseech his Majesty for a licence to review the Canons, and abrogate them; assuring myself that all my brethren will join with me to preserve the public peace, rather than any act of ours shall be thought a public grievance. And upon my credit with you I should have moved for this licence at the very first meeting of this Parliament, but that both myself and others did fear the House of Commons would take offence at it—as they did at the last,—and said we did it on purpose to prevent them. I understand you mean to speak of this business in the House to-morrow, and that hath made me write these lines to you, to let you know our meaning and desires. And I shall take it for a great kindness to me, and a great service to the Church, if by your means the House will be satisfied with this, which is here offered of abrogating the Canons. To God's blessed protection, I leave you, and rest your loving poor friend, W. CANT.—Lambeth, Nov. 29, 1640.—I mean to move the King this day for a licence, as is within mentioned." "From the original, amongst the papers of Mr. Seldon, now in the hands of Nicholas Harding, Esq., Clerk of the Honourable House of Commons:" Gen. Dic. Hist. and Critical, 1738; fo. vol. vi., art. Laud, p. 646.

together with his 'Protestant religion,' *alias* Popery, though but 'improperly' so called!^a

"He complains for want of '*room* to die;' which he needed not, for he had too much of *Rome*, that brought him to die. 'I beseech you,' saith he, 'let me have an end of this misery:' for all this haste, he should have laid a better and surer foundation to build his hope upon for freedom from a future 'misery' . . . than yet we have seen in him. Nor could he find a word in Scripture to satisfy Sir John Clotworthy's question, for any assurance that he had of a better life: and just was this with God, the righteous Judge, that as he was a great deceiver, and vilifier of the Scripture, as 'The light which is in Scripture itself, is not bright enough; it cannot bear sufficient witness to itself:' that, 'the belief of Scripture to be the Word of God, dependeth primarily upon the authority and tradition of the present church:' that 'it is a candle which hath no light till it be lighted; which is first by the tradition of the present Church':^b that, notwithstanding these and many more most gross derogations from the self-sufficiency, authority, and light of Scriptures to demonstrate itself to be the Word of God; he saith, 'he hath given to the Scripture enough, and more than enough,' etc. Just, I say, was it with God, that this wretched Prelate, for so vilifying, yea, annihilating the sufficiency of Scripture light, should be left altogether without so much light as to light him to so much as one place of Scripture that might minister unto him some solid comfort at the hour of his death! . . . Thus he dies one that was over-true to his old principles, as in his life so at his death; and thus he is as good as his word in his 'Relation,' where he tells the King thus, 'In the publishing hereof, I have obeyed your Majesty, discharging my duty to my power to the Church of England, given account of the hope that is in me, and so testified to the world that faith in which I have lived, and, by God's blessing and favor, purpose to die.' . . .^c

"I shall conclude with a passage or two in my 'Reply,' written in my banishment at Guernsey, above four years ago, in answer to the Prelate's 'Relation,' towards the end: 'Bethink yourself how sudden the time may be that you 'must go and give account,' as you say, 'to God and Christ,' of the talent committed to your 'charge' which you cannot so easily answer before that Judge as you could do in the Star Chamber. And remember what you said to the Jesuit, 'Our reckoning will be heavier if we thus mislead on either side, than theirs that follow us. But I see I must look to myself, for you are secure!'^d And are not you full out as 'secure,' as the Jesuit? But in that, you pray, that God for Christ's sake would be merciful to you: but, is that enough to wipe off all old scores, to say, 'God be merciful to me?' when the whole course of a man's life hath been a very enmity and rebellion against Christ: when he lieth, spends and squandereth the talent of his strength and wit, learning, means, and friends, to the dishonour of God, in oppressing Christ's Word; persecuting his servants and members, profaning and polluting the service of God with superstitious inventions of men, and will-worship; forcing men's consciences

^a Reply, p. 74, 405, 86, 87.

^b Relation, p. 80, 83—85: see Reply.

^c Ep. Ded. p. 12.

^d Relation, p. 116.

to Conformity; using all cruelty, even to blood, and the like; will 'Lord have mercy upon me,' without any more ado, serve the turn to salve all again? But where is your hearty repentance for all your scarlet and Episcopal sins? your High-Commission sins? your Star Chamber sins? your Council-table sins? nay, is not your foul conscience still seared and stupified? is not your heart still hardened? O stupid conscience! O desperate soul! O shameless hypocrite! O blasphemous wretch! Dost thou thank God, to make him the author of all thy impiety, iniquity, cruelty, craft, hypocrisy, and dissimulation, of thy faithless and false heart, in thy plotting to bring thy false truth and thy turbulent peace with the 'whore of Babylon'—that notorious enemy of Christ and of his true spouse, his church—to a meeting, a blessed meeting; yea, to a cursed meeting? This is that peace and truth which you contend for; for the procuring and meeting whereof, all truth shall be corrupted, and peace perturbed, not only in the church but in civil states and kingdoms, when, for the maintenance of your truth and peace, princes shall be set against their people, and people forced to stand for their liberties against Prelatical usurpation and tyrannical invasion.^a

"But I conclude: if such was his deplored [sic] condition then, as to lie naked to such language, how is the measure thereof now filled up in an obstinate out-facing and maintaining all his wickedness perpetrated since that till now; and that, before the high bar of the kingdom, the very tribunal of God; and, at last, upon the very scaffold pouring out his blood in a most obdurate, desperate, and final impenitency? O that this might be an example to all that tread in his steps! . . . This is that Canterburian Arch-prelate, in his life-time heir-apparent to the Popedom; subtle, false, treacherous, cruel, carrying two faces under one hood; Satan's second child, whoever is the first; as hard to speak truth, as to do good, or to repent of any evil, as his father the devil; an inveterate adversary to Christ and all true Christians; an underminer of the Civil State; a traitor to his country; wilfully damning his own soul to save the credit of his cursed cause; sealing with his blood the King's part, with Rome's, to be righteous, and the Parliament's odious, that so he might be as unlike to Sampson as possible, to do as much, if not more, mischief to his native country at his death as he had done in his life; and, therefore, worthy to have died the ancient death of persecutors, or traitors to their country, which the ancient Romans used—to be sewed up in a culleus, or leather sack, and cast into the water, and there to perish as unworthy to touch either earth or water, or air, as nature's outcast."

So much for Burton. Now, for his opposites; and first for the truculent Anthony à Wood, who, in allusion to both Houses of Parliament, writes that "the cheated multitude were taught to misconceive" this, "the King's and the Church's martyr;" and adds, "yet impartial posterity will know how to value him, when they hear [that] the *rebels* sentenced him on the same day they voted down the Liturgy of the Church of England."^b Next, for England's pensioned Laureate, whose *sackbut* resounds with some additional flourishes, the prelude

^a Reply, p. 402.

^b Athenæ Oxon. vol. iii. col. 144.

of the Oxford piper. "A baser triumph," so writes Southey, "never was obtained by faction, nor was any triumph ever more basely celebrated. Even after this murder had been committed with all the mockery of law, his memory was assailed in libels of blacker virulence, if that be possible, than those by which the deluded populace had been instigated to cry out for his blood; and to this day those who have inherited the opinions of the Puritans, repeat with unabashed effrontery the imputations against him, as if they had succeeded to their implacable temper, and their hardihood of slander also. . . The martyrdom of Cranmer is not more inexpiably disgraceful to the Papists, than that of Laud to the Puritan persecutors."^a

Doubtless "there was good and bad in the Puritans, and there was good and bad in Laud;"^b and surely Laud's goodness none can dispute, since he was "addressed at Oxford, under the appellations of 'Holy Father,' and 'Your Holiness!'"^c Shall a portion of his badness be agreed to, if recorded here in his own words spoken in the Tower? "I have endeavoured to repair an old house; but it fell to ruin about my ears!"^d "Thus Laud fell, and the Church fell with him," writes his *Cyprianic* encomiast.^e The difficulty of estimating the character of Laud," says a modern Prelate, "consists in our being unable to determine the standard by which his conduct is to be measured. If we regard him as a christian bishop, the picture will be in many respects sadly deficient; to look upon him merely as a statesman, is to degrade the sacred office with which he was invested; to view him only as a man, is to divest him of all that is worth examining, and to pass sentence concerning those particulars on which God only is the Judge. . . None but a Churchman could write a life of Laud, and few Churchmen are sufficiently free from the same feelings as prevailed in his day, to form the estimate fairly."^f

We are now prepared to proceed, by introducing another specimen of the animadversions which were made upon Laud's general conduct while living, and his deportment previously to making his exit. But we shall first record the judgment of another Episcopalian concerning this Primate: "As he possessed such a natural temper, it was a misfortune to him to be placed in the high rank of a metropolitan and prime minister. On account of his high principles in church and state, he was no friend to the constitution of his country, and so he made many to be his implacable enemies. Though his Grace was a learned man,

^a "The Book of the Church. By Robert Southey, Esq. L.L.D. Poet Laureate, &c. Edit. 4. 1837." 8vo. chap. xvii. p. 500, 501.

^b Christian Observer: June, 1837. p. 383.

^c *Ibid.* March, 1837. p. 176.

^d Echard's Hist. of England. vol. 1. p. 483, note a. ^e Heylyn, p. 539, and in his title-page.

^f "A Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution, 1688. By Thomas Vowler Short, D.D. 1838. Edit. 2." 8vo. Sect. 582, p. 417. This Dr. has since become bishop of Sodor and Man. It is of some moment to us, that he "asserted" in the Preface to his first edition, that "The Book of the Church" is "not free from such views of the subject as can never contribute to the discovery of truth." This "vague imputation" having given occasion of remonstrance, in the fourth edition of "The Book," Dr. Short apologises in this edition of his "Sketch," for expressions which "ought never to have been printed:" but whether this be a retractation in full, let those say who can!

yet he was more a man of business than of letters!"^a To whom the initials of the writer of the following piece belong, does not appear, nor has his religious denomination been discovered; so that his testimony, besides being contemporaneous is also corroborative of Burton's. The title stands thus, "Jehoiadah's Justice against Mattan, Baal's Priest: Or, The Covenanters' Justice against Idolaters. A Sermon preacht upon occasion of a Speech uttered upon Tower-hill. Wherein you may find his likeness to Mattan rather than to Christ: His place in John xi. 48, charged upon Himself: The weakness of the choice of his Text: How great cause we have to give Thanks. By J. H., Minister of the Gospel.—Judges v. 31.—1645." 4to. pp. 16.

This "minister," Presbyterian, as we suppose, takes his text from 2 Chron. xxiii. 16, 17; and in applying it, he asks, "How should we increase our joy by considering what, in times past, he did"—meaning this representative of the original Mattan,—"which he shall never do? He shall never more play the 'Beast' against the 'Lamb,' nor set up superstition above worship; nor open a door to thrust out holiness and let in profaneness; nor accuse strictness as hypocrisy, and cry up liberty for religion! He shall no more give liberty to profane the Sabbath; nor set up maypoles as his pillars, to proclaim all strict observing of the Sabbath to be Jewish; or rear them up as spears and weapons of war, against the holiness of that day! He shall no more set up candlesticks, and put down catechising; nor deify singing [cathedral] service, and suppress lectures; nor tolerate plays, and suppress christian liberty in private communion for fasting, to increase faith and renew repentance; nor countenance men in profaneness, and convent men as offenders to his tribunal, for sanctifying their families in conceiving prayer! He shall no more watch opportunities against the Watchmen and faithful Pastors of the land, that were the Lord's husbandmen to turn many to righteousness: he shall no more remove them from their congregations by suspensions, extensions, forcing to banishment; by imprisonment, by famishment, by death; nor make their lives grievous by threats and scorns! He shall no more seduce the kings of the earth, nor delude great ones, nor overawe the judges to cause wrong judgment to proceed; nor terrify the counsellor that he dares not plead for his client; nor slay the fatherless in judgment, nor condemn the guiltless! He shall no more exalt the proud; be a terror to the just, a vexation to the thirsty soul, in taking away the bread of life from congregations that faint for the word of consolation to build them up in faith! He shall no more sow sedition, set kingdoms on fire, raise war against the peaceable, despise dominions, nor study to subvert judicatures! In a word, he shall no more, in any wise, lord it over God's heritage; not 'sit upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north,'^b for the Lord hath swept him away 'with the besom of destruction!'^c Now, what is our duty, but to rejoice in the God of our salvation?

"Would one imagine there could live so much impudence so near a

^a Rev. John Jones, in his "Life and Times, &c. of Bishop Hall." 1826. 8vo. p. 326.

^b Isai. xiv. 13.

^c Ver. 23.

sudden death, as for a man—so eminent an enemy of all righteousness in his life, an oppressor in a high nature; a persecutor of rich and poor that set their faces towards Sion,—I say, for him,—in an open place, on the scaffold of death, before such a confluence of people of this city, that have had such open testimony of his pride and cruelty,—to justify himself by the example of our Lord Jesus? For wherefore else were those words chosen, Heb. xii. 1, 2, and this gloss, that ‘he despised the shame for Jesus?’ Durst any but a spirit past holy fear and humility, compare himself with Christ in that particular of his sufferings; his beheading, with Christ’s crucifying; and his ignominy, with Christ’s undeserved ‘shame?’ Weigh but the imparity of the parallel, when you have considered one not well-shapen passage, ‘Christ despised the shame for me; and God knows, I despise the shame for Christ:’ if the speech be comparative, as, he for my example, so I by his example, and no more; then he died a Socinian, not a Protestant. But how unlike are the sufferers! Christ, ‘for the joy that was set before him,’ was going to his Father; but this man, for grief that he could live no longer to vex Christ in his members, was going to the tribunal of Him whom he had pierced! In Christ’s mouth there was no guile; under this man’s lips were nothing else but deceit and strife. Christ endured the cross in obedience to his Father’s will, and as our Surety; but this man despised the cross, as a fool goeth laughing to the stocks. Christ despised the shame, as being no way conscious of desert; but this man, endureth the shame, as the just wages of his ambition and pride. Christ entered into his glory, and laid down his reproach; but this man, laid down his honour at one blow, and liveth under perpetual ignominy; Christ prayed for them that cried him down to be crucified; but this man, hath branded a famous city with sedition, for praying for justice on the kingdom’s disturbers. Christ endured the contradiction of sinners; but this man, sought to set dissension between two Houses, in clearing his judges, and condemning them that accused him unto them. Finally: Christ died as a ‘Lamb;’ but this man, as a fox, whom Christ ‘the Lord of glory’ hath taken away, never to destroy His vines any more!”^a

Deterred by no unmanly fear, and encouraged by no prospect of human applause, we have not withheld what we have recorded as said and done by and against one who had daringly assumed the prerogative to mould and fashion the faith of all the souls in three kingdoms; and by thus prostrating their wills, would have succeeded in his purpose of bringing their bodies into subjection.

“This fierce Inquisitor *had* chief
Dominion over men’s belief
And manners.”^b

^a P. 12, 13.—There appeared also, “A full and satisfactory Answer to the Archbishop of Canterbury’s Speech, or Funeral Sermon preached by Himself, on Tower-hill, on Friday the 10th of January, 1644-5, upon Heb. xii. 1, 2: At which time, he was there and then beheaded. Wherein is a full and plenary Discourse to satisfy all those who have been startled with his Subtle and Jesuitical Fallacies and Evasions in the said Speech. And other Passages and Observations of great consequence to satisfy the Expectation of the Kingdom therein.—Isai. xiv. 16.—1645.” 4to. pp. 23.

^b Butler’s Hudibras. Pt. i. C. iii. applied there, to a “Lay-elder.”

He missed his aim ; as he righteously ought to do, when such was his end, and oppression his means ! Laud was vanquished, and so dire was the necessity which he had caused, that a vigour beyond the customary rules of criminal justice sent him also to render a faithful account at the unimpeachable tribunal of HIM who “maketh inquisition for blood.”^a

He shall have the full benefit, and our readers the fair opportunity it will afford them, derivable from his written Prayer : subjected as we have seen, for that reason, to animadversions more free than what might be regarded otherwise strictly proper, had it been an out-burst of the heart and conscience at the most awful crisis of human responsibility. We append, purposely, that it might not prevent a calm judgment, what stands better as an *epilogue* here, than as a *prologue* in its original place.

“O ETERNAL GOD and merciful Father, look down upon me in mercy, in the riches and fulness of all thy mercies look down upon me ; but not till Thou hast nailed my sins to the cross of Christ, not till thou hast bathed me in the blood of Christ, not till I have hid myself in the wounds of Christ, that so the punishment due unto my sins may pass over me. And since Thou art pleased to try me to the utmost, I humbly beseech Thee, give me now, in this great instant, full patience, proportionable comfort, and a heart ready to die for Thine honour, the King’s happiness, and this Church’s preservation. And my zeal to this—far from arrogance be it spoken!—is all the sin—human frailty excepted, and all the incidents thereunto,—which is yet known to me in this particular, for which I now come to suffer ; I say, in this particular of Treason ; but otherwise, my sins are many and great : Lord, pardon them all ; and those especially—whatever they are—which have drawn down this present judgment upon me. And when thou hast given me strength to bear it, do with me as seems best in thine own eyes : and carry me through death, that I may look upon it in what visage soever it shall appear to me. Amen.

“And, that there may be a stop of this issue of blood in this more than miserable kingdom,—I shall desire that I may pray for the people too, as well as for myself,—O Lord, I beseech Thee, give grace of repentance to all blood-thirsty people : but if they will not repent, O Lord, confound all their devices, defeat and frustrate all their designs and endeavours upon them, which are or shall be contrary to the glory of thy great Name ; the truth and sincerity of religion ; the establishment of the King and his posterity after him in their just rights and privileges ; the honour and conservation of Parliaments in their just power ; the preservation of this poor Church in her truth, peace, and patrimony ; and the settlement of this distracted and distressed People under their ancient laws, and in their native liberty. And when thou hast done all this in mere mercy to them, O Lord, fill their hearts with thankfulness, and with religious, dutiful obedience to Thee and thy commandments all their days. Amen, Lord Jesus, Amen : and receive my soul into thy bosom. Amen.—Our Father which art in heaven, etc.”^b

The *epilogue* alluded to, is the production of the “Laureate” in

^a Psal. ix. 12.

^b Heylyn, p. 535.

these terms: "He had prepared a prayer for the occasion, and never was there a more solemn and impressive form of words; it is alike remarkable for the state of mind in which it was composed and uttered; the deep and passionate devotion which it breathes, and the last firm fervent avowal of that religious loyalty, for which he was at that instant about to die a martyr. To abridge it even of a word would be injurious, for if any human composition may be called sacred, this surely deserves to be so qualified."^a But with all his admiration, this eulogist has not favoured his readers with the addendum given in Heylyn;^b delivered, it should seem *extemporally*, and so, worth no more than a passing notice. Having, says Heylyn, given the executioner "a sign when the blow should come, he kneeled," and prayed; "LORD, I am coming as fast [as] I can; I know I must pass through the shadow of death before I can come to see Thee: but it is but *umbra mortis*, a mere shadow of death, a little darkness upon nature; but Thou, by thy merits and passion, hast broke through the jaws of death. The Lord receive my soul, and have mercy upon me, and bless this kingdom with peace and plenty, and with brotherly love and charity, that there may not be this effusion of christian blood amongst them; for Jesus Christ, his sake, if it be thy will." When the signal was given, the executioner "very dexterously did his office."

Of all this procedure, strange to say, there is not a word, reflecting upon the deed as an atrocity, dropped from the pen of the cumber-somely learned "John Hacket, late Lord Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry." But because it is of the utmost importance that the true light of history should be permitted to show Laud in every incontestable shade of character, and because no one is able to reflect it better than his contemporaries and his compeers, we borrow a portion of this writer's "Memorials offered to the Great Deservings of John Williams, D.D., who sometime held the Places of Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, Lord Bishop of Lincoln, and Lord Archbishop of York;"^c and who died March 25th, 1650.

"Of all men, Bishop Laud was the party whose enmity was most tedious, and most spiteful against his great benefactor, Lincoln! He battered him with old and new contrivances, fifteen years: his very dreams were not without them, as they are enrolled in his memorials drawn out with his own hand. I will touch that fault, that great fault, with a gentle hand, because of that good that was in him; because, in other things, I believe for my part, he was better than he was commonly thought; [and] because his death did extinguish a great deal of envy. I meet with him in his worst action that ever he did, and cannot shun it. . . But his part is in every act and scene of a tragical persecution of fifteen years: Hoc etiam ipsi culpabunt mali.^d Perhaps it began from an emulation to keep him back who was only like to be Bishop Laud's competitor for the greatest place of our Church. Had it gone no further, it might be censured moderately, for a common temptation. No wonder if the *seal* and the *sword-fish* never swim

^a "The Book of the Church," *sup.* p. 498.

^b P. 537.

^c Folio, 1693; but finished being written Feb. 1657-8, pt. ii. p. 229.

^d Plaut. in Bacchid.

quietly in the same channel! . . . Spalato says,^a that John, Bishop of Constantinople, that assumed to himself the title of 'Universal Bishop' or 'Patriarch,' was a good man, given greatly to alms and fasting, but too much addicted to advance the title of his See; which made a plausible Prelate seem to be Antichrist, to Gregory the Great."^b What need we more? Here is the *bellum episcopale intestinum*, if not *internecinum*, exposed; and now, which is the greater "Saint," Laud, or Hildebrand the seventh Gregory?^c

It is remarked with considerable acumen, that, "Physiognomy does not play us false in offering this man's face as an index of his character. Vandyke pourtrayed his features, and in the portrait which yet survives, the diminutive eyes, contracted forehead, pointed nose, and compressed *tout-ensemble*, warn us to expect that littleness and cunning, that acuteness and meanness, which were his mental characteristics!"^d

CHAP. LXI.

TRACT, BY D. P. P.—ANOTHER, BY W. L.; OF GREAT HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE.—A THIRD, BY JOHN PRICE.—BAILLIE.

WE begin this chapter with "An Antidote against the Contagious Air of Independency. Showing, I. Six sufficient Grounds why they ought to revoke their Schismatical Principles: II. Six Parallels betwixt theirs and the Jesuitical Practices. By D. P. P.—Feb. 13, 1644[-5.] *Imprimatur*, Ja. Cranford." 4to. pp. 24.

This anonymous Puritan commences by bewailing "the sudden change that is befallen to this kingdom in so short a time;"^e but, he tells us, "that which doth most of all increase the wrath of God against us is that some of our Clergymen that should, like Moses,^f stand in the gap to appease the Lord's anger, are they that inflame the same by the contentions and schisms they foment, in the church of God, about the establishing of a new way of Church-government which they have brought from Holland or America,—where they were constrained to fly by the over-rigorous courses of the Prelacy,—having been infected with this *contagious air* by sojourning, in these parts, among sectaries; so that thinking, by flight, to avoid a rock, they have cast themselves upon a quicksand that may, if God in his mercy prevent it not, *conduce* their souls to greater danger than their bodies were during the persecution of [by] the Archbishop Laud."^g "They,

^a M. A. De Dominis, Abp. of Spalato; De Reip. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. vii. par. 13.

^b Pt. ii. p. 65, 66.

^c The coincidence between the two, is peculiarly striking in a number of particulars described by Dr. Southey himself, in his "Book of the Church," *passim*.

^d G. W. Johnson, in his Memoir of Selden, p. 311.—Lawson, by prefixing to his Life of Laud an engraving from Vandyke, has thus enabled his readers to judge of the disagreement between the fidelity of the painter and that of the biographer.

^e P. 3.

^f Exod. xxxii. 11—13.

^g P. 5.

having been infected with this contagious air of Independency, oppose, as much as in them lieth, the Presbyterial Government, . . . and endeavour to bring in this new revealed way, . . . and, by a kind of mercenary way, [have] robbed divers of their brethren of the ministry of some of the fattest sheep of their flocks." [!]^a

i. "Their new way must needs, by all ingenuous spirits, be acknowledged, in this time of war and civil discord, inconvenient to be pressed or required; . . . for none will deny that one body with an absolute head, will more easily be kept in unity and concord than many thousand bodies that have, every one of them, a head that is absolute, and hath neither reference nor dependency with any other authority but of its own body. . . . We should establish 9,324, that would, like so many caterpillars, devour the substance, or every green thing,^b of the land; and suck more blood, of the common people, in one year, than the Star Chamber, the High Commission, the Arches, or all the Bishops' Courts, could do in six, although their hunger was insatiable."^c

ii. "This new way is altogether incompatible, and the greatest antagonist that can be, to the royal, to the parliamentary, and their subordinate authority. But because this point hath been so clearly proved by Master Prynne, I will pass it over. . . ."^d

iii. "For men to gather secret congregations, and rend in pieces—as some Independents do—the mystical body of Christ,—I say, some, for they do not all separate themselves from the church, nor fall into that sin of offence, Matt. xviii. 6,—under colour that their consciences are so tender that they cannot receive the communion in a mixt congregation without offence; . . . in this case, their consciences are offended without cause, . . . because it is impossible for them to obtain,—should they separate every month, and change their private congregations,—one so pure as to be free from all hypocrites, profane, or ill-prepared receivers: for of four men that entered into the ark, by the commandment of God, one of them was an atheist and wicked hypocrite;^e and amongst our blessed Redeemer's twelve apostles, Judas, 'the son of perdition,'^f was one. . . ."^g Now, if they conceive that the sin of an impenitent receiver is transferred to them if they receive the Communion with him, they are . . . as much polluted by the company of hypocrites as by the company of known sinners; but it is certain that the guilt of an impenitent receiver is not transferred upon the well prepared receiver, for if it were, God's promises were in vain. . . ."^h Notwithstanding, whatsoever I have said or shall say concerning this point, it is not to excuse the carelessness of the pastors or elders that admit notorious sinners to so blessed a sacrament; . . . but it is to show that such are to blame that do separate themselves from their parish congregations because some few known sinners are admitted to the sacrament of the Lord's supper by the carelessness of the pastors, churchwardens, or elders of their parish; and especially now the Honourable Houses have taken order that this abuse should be redressed. . . . As it is impossible for us to handle pitch without our hands be stained and besmeared with it, even so it is impossible to converse

^a P. 6.^b Exod. x. 5.^c P. 7, 8.^d P. 8.^e Gen. vii. 7, with ix. 22.^f John xvii. 12.^g Matt. xxvi. 20, 25.^h Ezek. xviii. 19, 20.

with the wicked without we be, in time, accessory to some one or other of their wicked actions: and the like, to converse familiarly, or to go constantly to hear the Independents' sermons, without one be tainted with the *contagious air* of their Positions!

iv. "This new way, and the separation of Independents from their parish churches, is an encouragement to all Separatists, Brownists, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Socinians, and Libertines, that are in and about the city; for they shelter themselves under their name, and when they are taken in their conventicles by some of the public officers and enforced to answer for themselves, they affirm to be 'Independents,' to cover their heresies; it being an ordinary thing among the wicked, to disguise themselves under the name of such that are reputed to be more sincere than themselves. For although the Independents gather congregations, and separate themselves from their parish congregations as the Sectaries do, yet they are, for the greater part, sound in doctrine, and dissent from us only in discipline; but the Sectaries are erroneous both in doctrine and discipline: . . . and, 'surely if it were unlawful,' say they, 'such learned and religious men as they are would not be example of offence and of evil to others!' And, by this means, are a stumbling-block to them and the cause that the wicked are hardened in the ways of error and impiety.

v. "This revealed Discipline is inferior to the Presbyterial Government in this point, That the effect of the issue is uncertain: whereas the Presbyterial, is approved by the happy success it hath had, for many years, in Switzerland, France, Holland, and Scotland. But this, is a mere novelty that may be compared to the projects of some young mathematician drawn upon paper, that promise much, but when they are to be put in practice are, ordinarily, of no use at all; or like to some of our engineer models that seem to promise, in a small form, divers rare effects, . . . there is not one among a hundred, when they are set up, that proves to be successful, because some spring, wheel, or counterpoise, is either too weak, too small, or too light, to endure the violent motion of it; . . . even so it would fall out with this new revealed way, if our supreme magistrates were so credulous as to try the operation of it,—the which, the Lord prevent!—for although it might be effectual in some small congregations in Holland, or some small boroughs in America, yet it would certainly be destructive to this populous kingdom; and would prove, like Plato's Commonweal, beautiful in conceits and imaginations, but altogether unuseful. . .

vi. "If this new way should take place, and every pastor with his elders to be absolute over their congregation, we should, as the French proverb saith, 'fall from a quotidian to a burning fever,' and from one hierarchy of prelates raise 9,324 of Independents—as I said before;—for there are so many parishes in this kingdom, and they cannot, conveniently, be reduced in a lesser number of congregations. Now, what unity can be expected among so many lawless men, whose actions and doctrine are not to be controlled by any civil or ecclesiastical authority? . . . But if this new way should take place, what impiety would not be committed, or what heresies would not be invented, to please the palate of their auditors for to increase the number of their

congregations and the revenue of their contributions; or, out of ambition to be reputed more precise and singular than their brethren, or neighbour pastors, upon which would ensue unheard-of divisions, contentions, and confusions, as it fell out in the time of Micah when 'there was no king in Israel?'..^a There never were two such insulting prelates in the Christian world as cardinal Wolsey, and William Laud archbishop of Canterbury; and yet the first was but a butcher's son, and the second a poor cloth-worker's son. The first, durst presume to name himself before [he had named] his king; and the second, to control his prince, re-form the royal oath, and insult over the supreme court of this kingdom: even so, if this new way should take place, we should have many thousand petty tyrants domineering over their congregations, . . and as many religions as pastors. . . But the Presbyterian Discipline is a medium way between hierarchy and a democratical government: . . the kingdom being divided into twelve classes, and every classis having six reverend divines appointed to call, twice a year, all the pastors that shall be under their jurisdiction, before them, and to examine and determine of all cases as well for doctrine, discipline, and misdemeanour in life and conversation; and these twelve classes to be called, once a year, to a national synod for to judge of the appeals and of the greater affairs of the church. This medium way, I say, is able to suppress all schisms, and to keep the clergy in that purity of doctrine and discipline as is befitting the true ministers of God.

"These reasons, then, should, in my opinion, induce the Independents to reunite themselves with the church of God [!] . . to endeavour to convince the Sectaries of their errors, by the sword of the Spirit; but if they will, desperately, remain obstinate, then to lend their helping hand to their brethren of the ministry to remove them from hence; that they may not draw, any longer, the judgments of God upon this nation, as they have done for conniving at them [the Sectaries]; which kind of halting between two opinions is most odious to God, for it is impossible to serve God and Mammon! And, in so doing, they will vindicate themselves of these six imputations following, which are daily cast upon them; which, otherwise, will confirm this opinion in the common people, That there is seldom any smoke without fire.

1. "That they are as like Roman Jesuits in their principles, method, insinuations, equivocations, and fallacies, as two parallel lines are like one another.

2. "As the Jesuits will not charge themselves with any parish-cures, but desire rather to instruct scholars in the liberal arts, preach funeral sermons all the Lent long; even so, our Independents shun all parish-cures, and endeavour to obtain as many *legative* lectures as they can, for to avoid the extraordinary pains that parish-cures require; and in lieu of scholars, they gather to themselves as many disciples as they can, and of them they frame private congregations of which they require a covenant for to contribute to the necessities of their pastors, and an oath or promise to follow him wheresoever he is enforced to flee, whether it be in Holland or in America: and so, by these lectures, that are the most certain rents to men and punctually paid of

^a Jud. xvii. 6.

any, and the contributions of their private congregations, their yearly revenue doth excel the yearly coming-in of the best parish-cures!

3. "The Independents entice and allure to their side the most acute spirits, and insinuate themselves cunningly with the richest and most eminent persons where they live; and allure the best and richest families to their private congregations, whereby they increase their revenue, and obtain the best *legative* lectures about the city; and had they the use of the auricular confession,—as well as the Jesuits,—that they might use their insinulative faculty to dying men and women, they would undoubtedly excel the Jesuits in riches and domains.

4. "Wherever the Jesuits set footing... even so, wherever the Independents are admitted, they impoverish all their brethren of the ministry; for they draw from them, after a mercenary way, the fattest and best woolled sheep they have in their flock, to increase the contributions of their private congregations: moreover, they are generally hated of their neighbours for their vain ostentation and avarice; for although they would be accounted to be humble, yet they will not give way to the best, and will have their own opinion to be reputed as a law, and their arguments—although they are sometimes weak and ridiculous—to be infallible; and for their avarice, it is apparent, for their revenue exceeds the best parish-cures.

5. "The Jesuits, wherever they come... even so, the Independents wherever they come, they foment discord in church and commonwealth: for proof of it, we need no other than our own experience, for since they are come from Holland and America they have increased our divisions, and retarded, by the one moiety of the time, the establishing of the 'Directory' of the discipline of the church and of the true reformation. And their separation, and their gathering of private congregations, have encouraged the Sectaries in their erroneous ways; that for one Anabaptist or Antinomian that was among us when they came over, there are now ten.

6. "As the Jesuits have an extraordinary opinion of themselves; even so, have the Independents a certain immoveable self-conceitedness of their own sufficiency and sanctity... Is it not an unheard-of obstinacy, that *six* of them should oppose and control the judgment and opinion of threescore and ten as learned and religious ministers as themselves?... Men begin to take notice of their carriage... If they continue in their wilfulness and obstinacy, God, notwithstanding their traversing endeavours, will bring this great work of Reformation to a blessed period in his due time, and they shall see it but as the prophet Elisha said, 2 Kings vii. 2, 'Thou shalt see it with thine eyes, but shalt not eat thereof.'..."

The following piece originated on the occasion of what is called "The New-Model" of the Army. It was now that the Independents were allowed to become soldiers, and how they signalized themselves history amply attests. A late author describes them as "perhaps the most remarkable men who had ever, in any nation, taken up arms for liberty."^a

^a Forster. Life of Cromwell. 1838. 12mo. Vol. i. p. 205.

“The Independents’ Military Entertainment: Or, Certain Reasons and Arguments why Independents ought not only to be admitted into the Army raised for Defence of Church and State, but also both by Law of God, Nature, and Nations, are required to put their Hands to the Plough of the Kingdom. Together with the Answering of such Grand Objections as tend to the Contrary. By W. L.^a—Licensed, Entered, and Printed, according to Order.—1645.” 4to. pp. 7.

The opening paragraph of this important tract, is its own best interpreter. “Since it hath pleased God,” writes this Presbyterian,—for he could be no other,—“to put into the heart of, and to enable our ever-honoured Parliament to new-form and constitute the Armies raised for the defence of themselves and kingdom, by which means consequently many Malignant and disaffected instruments formerly employed, are outed, . . . and therefore labour, might and main, to beget such a disaffection between them, to wit the Presbyterian and Independent party, as if the entertainment of both in the Army were inconsistent with the well-being and success of it: Now, seeing that both of them have ever been engaged in the work since the beginning, and that party so much pointed at no whit behind any other in faithfulness or courage, I thought good to declare to the public [that] that Independent party so much stumbled at, are not only very precious instruments to promote the present military affairs, but are no way to be discountenanced or their assistance and brotherly help declined, for these reasons ensuing.

“1. That our divisions are the enemies’ hopes: . . . and they daily endeavour to disunite us. . . 2. Those our friends whose absence we would so willingly waive are . . . men professing the same religion with us . . . only differing in and about circumstance, not the substance, of God’s worship; not any fundamental points of religion. 3. If Papists, Malignants, and desperate Delinquents, are the common adversaries of the kingdom, these men of all other are most likely to be real in their undertakings against them, whose principles are so utter contrary to them; they being, formerly, the objects of our Prelate’s persecution for that they knew them utter enemies to prelacy, popery, and profaneness. 4. They have, through God’s assistance, behaved themselves, in the Field and in the face of the enemy, very gallantly, as the common enemy himself confesseth; and certainly if it be a received tenet, among commanders, to entertain fighting men, although otherwise dissolute and profane, certainly these men that are conscientious . . . should not only be admitted but required and desired to assist the State, if for nothing else yet because they will fight. 5. It hath been too, too apparent, that divers professing themselves Protestants at large,—as our adversaries themselves do,—have proved very perfidious; who, having taken up arms for their own ends, have made use of their best opportunities to attain them by betraying their trust: and although we have had too many experiments of this kind, yet I never heard of any usually called ‘Independent,’ since the war began, that proved perfidious. 6. Consider our enemies are accounted old soldiers and politicians, and they tell us it is lawful for the King to call to his assistance

^a Query? William Lenthall.

Papists out of all countries; . . and shall we be so void of reason [as] to decline the help of our faithful friends of whose courage and zeal we have had sufficient testimony? . . 7. It is displeasing to God when men of one and the same religion—whose judgments differ in point of ceremony, not substance,—are disunited in affection and so either decline or deny each other assistance: and indeed, we can expect little peace in the kingdom so long as we have wars and fightings in our spirits one against another. . . 8. . . They, as well as others, are bound in conscience to help against the common adversaries; and shall we tie their hands behind them? . . 9. They are not truly called ‘Independent’ otherwise than to distinguish them from the Episcopal[ians] and Presbyterians; for no true church is independent: neither know we any such, in New England or elsewhere, that wholly decline the brotherly advice and assistance of the neighbouring churches in points of difficulty, either in doctrine or discipline. 10. What occasion of slighting have they given? Have they not been active and zealous to promote the affairs of the kingdom both with their persons and purses? Or, do we emulate and envy them for that they are more zealous than ourselves? . . 11. Methinks above all men our brethren the Scots should be so far from disaffecting them, that they should join heart and hand with them; for these men were especially those that, in the day of their trouble, stuck closest to them, although, at that time, not baptized into the name of ‘Independents:’ Prelates were not acquainted with any such title. 12. . . In some sense, I may truly say we are all ‘Independents,’ the kingdom over; for ever since Episcopacy was condemned and made shorter by the head, no other discipline being settled in the Church, wherein lies the great difference? Every man doth that that is right in his own eyes; and how long it may be thus, who knows? 13. If we would have them cashiered the Army, why not also cast out of the kingdom? . . He that is not thought fit to assist us, must consequently be thought as unfit to live amongst us; especially such men as hate neutralizing. . . If they be found fit to live in the kingdom, and men approved godly, by those best able to judge; why shall we condemn them for unprofitable and unuseful members? And although doubtless there are some—nay, too, too many,—that think if Independency be tolerated in the kingdom it will be like Moses’ [Aaron’s] ‘rod,’ and therefore would gladly have it cast out of the kingdom; truly I say this should satisfy, that it was Moses’ [Aaron’s] ‘rod’ that devoured the rest;^a and the rest were but the effects of ‘enchantments:’^b and if we shall cast out Independents for their conscience’ sake, by the same ground we may banish all religion! 14. They are men known to be lovers of religion and law, all of them: . . they have both lives and estates to save or lose as well as others. 15. We have more need to encourage them to join with us than decline their help; many of them already having laid down their arms, in reference to the Covenant; and many never would take up arms to fight for any cause or upon any terms at all, holding it unlawful. These then, that are willing, resolved, and men sufficiently known for their fidelity and courage, should rather be encouraged than anyway discountenanced. 16. Consider who they

^a Exod. vii. 12.^b Ver. 11.

are that are principal opposers of Independents, and would so gladly have them outed the Army; certainly none that are truly godly, whatsoever they pretend: for it is not that they are Independent, but that they are godly, they are envied: it is the power of Godliness, aimed at! And he that is now an enemy to Independents, were there not one of them left in the Army, would be as arch an adversary to Presbyterians so far as the power of Godliness is held forth in their conversation. This I am confident of, if men will swear and swill, drink and drab, as those that would have sway in the Armies have too long done and would still,—which can neither stand with the power of Godliness nor common honesty,—let them be Independent, Presbyterial, Prelatical, or Popish, all is one, birds of a feather would flock together! Not that I condemn all, now by course dismissed their commands and employments, for I knew many choice, worthy, gallant gentlemen outed by means of the ‘New Model;’ I only point at the profane atheistical party, for whose sakes the army hath been new formed; and who are the only enemies of Independents, and the power of Godliness, in whomsoever it is.

“Q.—But these Independents will not take the Covenant! What should they do amongst us? why shall we trust them?”

“A.—Many, nay most of them, have or will take it; only some few decline it, in point of conscience, questioning the lawfulness of pressing it upon them with all its circumstances; yet men resolved, without any such tie, having a principle within them leading them to be true to their trust, and no whit the more backward in their assistance. . .

“Q.—But they are principal causes of divisions in the Army, by preaching and teaching they know not what. They must be all preachers forsooth! . .

“A.—For that general charge, of being causers of divisions, it is no more than what formerly, even from the beginning to this day, hath been laid upon the back of religion. . . I presume, not one of forty do take upon them public administrations; and why should we condemn all the rest for those? . . I hope we reverence the godly learned of them; and so though some few forget themselves in this, making an idol of ignorance, as too many of us do of learning, yet take heed of condemning the rest that are both wise and godly. . . The Scriptures are of that latitude that a lamb may wade and yet an elephant swim in their ocean; so shall men do much good in their places, and may by their prayers, tears, and Christian duty, wrestle with God as usefully and profitably as fight with an enemy for the peace and welfare of church and commonweal: thus shall we build with one hand and fight with the other. Let us therefore bless God for such commanders and soldiers, and not envy them for their zeal. . . And whoever thou art that art an enemy to the Independents’ entertainment in the Army, be silent till all profane ones are cashiered: . . he that hath the least spark of true grace in his heart will not envy the power of Godliness in any man’s conversation whatsoever.”

We pass on to “Independency Accused, by nine several Arguments; Written by a Godly Learned Minister to a Member of Mr. John Goodwin’s Congregation: And Acquitted, by several Replies to the

said Arguments, by a Member of the same Church. In both which, sweetness of Spirit and soundness of Arguments have been endeavoured. —Gal. vi. 1.—Published according to Order. 1645." 4to. pp. 34.

From *Gangrene* Edwards we learn that this pamphlet was put forth by "one John Price, an Exchange-man, *Cretensis*' beloved disciple and one of his prophets."^a The initials "J. P."^b are, besides appearing in two other places, subjoined to the dedication "To the Reverend, my dear and loving Pastor, Mr. John Goodwin, Pastor of the Church in Coleman-street." Therein, we learn no more of the "ingenious Antagonist," than that he was a man of "piety and parts," with whom this opponent represents himself "unworthy to be named in competition." The "Reader" is informed that "The mind of the Lord, and Truth of Christ," was their "mutual design;" and, "I have not," adds J. P. "altered one word of his Letter; only whereas he writ it entire, I have presented thee with each argument and immediate replies, with a different character [type] between the one and the other, for thy more distinct apprehension of both." We can but give a modicum of either.

"My dear Friend.—You are not ignorant how respectful and reverent I have carried myself towards the Congregational Way, almost ever since you knew me; and [how] daily [I] am both praying and reading that I may be fully persuaded, in my own heart whether that or the other Way called Presbyterian be the Way of God! For this end, I have given myself to the perusal of Mr. Goodwin's 'Theomachia' and his justification of it against Mr. Prynne, and so far as my judgment reaches, he gets the better of him; but yet some doubts I have, to which I cannot pick answers out of both his books. . . Both God and men will expect from me that I be able to render a Scriptural reason of my faith and conscience; and therefore I request you, earnestly, to improve your interest in some friend—you know I have no acquaintance with any Divine of that way—to communicate their light to me in the following particulars. . .

"Dear Sir,— . . Upon the first reading thereof, I desired to engage myself into your christian acquaintance, and to return an answer, being desired hereunto, . . unto your Letter. . .

Arg. i. "Let it be granted, that the churches in the apostles' time were Congregational—for all national profession in the world was either Jewish or heathenish,—yet if they were to be precedent of the form of church-ordering and government forever under the Gospel, how could all the churches the apostles had constituted up and down the world, yea, and all particular Christians, be so corrupted as to suffer the government and worship of God to be taken from them so easily as that none, that I can hear of, are found upon record to have stood up for Christ and the Truth; but national-church government was brought in, and we cannot learn that there was any scuffle or contestation against it? I do not think there can be named one truth of God that Antichrist, or any other heretic, fought against, but it is possible with a little search or study to name those persons that disputed or writ or suffered in the defence of it! . . Where is the scribe? Is there no disputer, no martyr, to be found? What, not one . . that after-ages could speak of . . for willingly suffering shame, spoiling of goods, banishment, death, rather than Christ should be pulled down in his worship, and a national, false, church-government set up in the room of it? . . Where was the valour of their 'faith;' Heb. xi. 33, 34? . .

Reply. "This argument impleadeth Presbytery as well; . . for where read we of sufferers for Presbytery? . . You grant the churches consti-

^a Gangræna. Pt. iii. p. 160.

^b They are found in the preceding "Antidote," p. 7: was J. P.'s tract the first written, but the last printed?

tuted by the apostles Congregational : now, if we show this practice of theirs was intended as a pattern for us, and so taken by the most Primitive churches, we hope your demand will be satisfied, though we could not distinctly show you why none appeared in the defence of it ; of which, anon. . . The Holy Ghost hath, to some purpose surely, so punctually noted the manner of gathering and governing the churches planted by the apostles ; and what can this purpose be, but our imitation in things lawful and possible ? . . We may not do what they did not when they might, and the nature of things seemed to require it ; as the subjecting particular churches to a combination of elders which should have ordinary authority over the several congregations ; which they might have done, as well as to keep up the government in one city, which they did. . . And so affirmatively, what they did, for substance, we must. . . The churches in the first and second hundred years after Christ did take the apostles' practice for their pattern. . . This voluntary and occasional office of love became a *custom*, namely, for the lesser and obscurer churches to do nothing without the greater ; and for the greater, to exercise inspection and some kind of jurisdiction towards the lesser by way of charge and office ; till in the third century it was, by the council of Nice, established by a canon for a church-law. . . If it be said, these consisted of many congregations, and so were Presbyterian ; I answer, it cannot be found they were so ; nor disproved, that they were one congregation ; because we read so often both in Scriptural and ecclesiastical story, that they had one eldership, not several over them, and that they all met upon one great occasion together, as upon the choice or deposition of ministers, excommunication of members, etc. ; and if they did meet in several places, yet having one eldership over them, and not several elderships for the several companies ; and not being tied, any of them, to come to any one place more than another ; it doth no more argue they were many congregations, or hinder them being one—though inconvenient to be governed by reason of its vastness,—than it doth in Holland, where the case is so, or than in some great parishes in and about London ; where, though they meet in one place, yet cannot meet all together by reason of the multitude. . . It is far different from that government that makes many towns and cities one church, and draws them to subjection to one common Presbytery, and that in ordinary ; against which, many reasons might be given, though the other were admitted. . .

“ Greater truths than this of government have been stolen from the Church, without any great reluctancy, as far as appears ; as the reading of the Scriptures by the people, transubstantiation, . . adoration of the host, the mass itself, taking the cup from the people, etc. . . without much opposition, till long after.

“ The monuments of antiquity in this kind are very defective ; first, by the notable carelessness of writers in those times. ‘ It is a singular grief to me,’ saith Ludovicus,^a ‘ when I call to mind how diligently the actions of Alexander, Scipio, . . Socrates, . . and other captains and philosophers, have been noted, that there is no peril of their perishing ; but the doings of the apostles—except such as are set down in sacred Scripture,—martyrs, and saints, of our religion, yea and of the Church

^a Apud Illyricum, in Refutat. Brin. p. 15.

itself whether growing up or at full age, are covered in deep silence. For these things which are written, excepting a few only, are corrupted with feigned inventions, etc. :’ thus he, a man by profession a papist. Secondly ; because of the prevalency of the Romish faction, whereby all monuments almost, that seemed to oppose the intended usurpation, as the ancient government of the churches especially did, were either suppressed or some way violated ; as amongst many others, Dr. [Thomas] James hath discovered at large, in his book intituled ‘ The Corruption of the Fathers,’ etc. [1612. 4to.]

“ . . If there were any that resisted those that invaded that liberty, those are the examples of suffering, or at least contesting, for this government ; but the Bishops were the first that usurped the power of many churches, in ordinary : and these were often resisted by word, writing, and fact ; as appears not only by Aerius, who was counted a heretic for his labour, but also by Jerome, who saith that ‘ Bishops were brought in to prevent heresies and schisms, but that the churches were anciently governed by the joint counsel of the elders.’ Now this was either by the elders of the same church, or, if with others, it was a conjunction by way of christian-fellowship and society ; not by jurisdiction, authority, and necessity—as we saw before. I add, that the sufferings of so many in opposition to papal government even in ancient times ; is an argument, in a negative sense, that there hath been sufferings for church-government, because they would not submit to a false government. . .

Arg. iii. “ ‘ Why do not our Congregational divines write to the brethren of New England, and convince them of their error, who give, as some say, the civil magistrate a power to question doctrines [and] censure errors ? Sure we are, some have been imprisoned, some banished, that pleaded religion and mere conscience, and were no otherwise disturbers of the civil peace than the Congregational-Way is like to be here.’ . .

Reply. “ This is an argument, or rather an insinuation, to the accusing of our brethren, than to the finding out of truth. But . . in relation to our brethren’s practice in New England ; I answer you in this case as the father of the blind man answered the Pharisees, . . John ix. 21, ‘ He is of age ; ask him :’ . . they stand or fall to their own Master. I suppose it is easier to affirm than to prove that any were imprisoned or banished merely for their consciences. We have a common proverb that ‘ Untruths lose nothing by distance of place ;’ and by often reporting, some affirm it hath been so as you say ; others deny the same. For my part, because I have more reason to believe the one than the other—because the magistrates themselves deny any persecution merely for a man’s private conscience, in the case of Mrs. Hutchinson, ‘ The rise and end of Antinomianism in New England,’ p. 46 of the first edition,^a—I had rather look unto these things that do concern us at home, than to go so far to accuse our brethren abroad.

“ I humbly suppose it is out of your certain knowledge, that the Congregational divines have not at all written unto their brethren of New England about this business ; and have not received satisfaction herein, I suppose likewise ! I have as much reason, if not more, to affirm that they have, as you, that they have not. But suppose they

^a By Thomas Welde, 1644. 4to.

have not written, this will prove but the remissness of their duty at the most, and will not facilitate and ease the business in the least. Doubtless, the Presbyterian party [practise], in other parts of the world, not all things according to the mind of God, even in the judgments of the Brethren-Presbyterians of this nation; and if so, may not the same thing be retorted upon them, which you do here upon these?

“As for those jealousies which you say are in ‘some’ about the Congregational Brethren’s ‘simplicity and sincerity of spirit,’ in ‘preferring God’s will, and the naked Truth, above any ends of their own!’ as God’s royal prerogative in searching all hearts, should stifle such misprisions and quit all such unworthy surmisings, till better proof appear; so any man’s reason, not mastered with prejudice and discontent, should fully discharge all such vain, unworthy, and uncharitable imaginations concerning their brethren: for, except men’s ‘ends’ and aims should be sorrow, trouble, reproach, and contempt; perplexity and misery; penury and want; what other ‘ends’ can they have?.. Surely, the men of their jealousies are not usually steered up and down from one place to another, by the golden lure of a hundred or two or three hundred a year, as many of their censorious judges are! But it is worthy our observation, the saints of our Most High God, many times, are chiefly charged for those things whereof they are least guilty, and where they are most innocent, and therefore most able to bear the same.”

Here we take up, in continuation, Baillie’s Letters at the period when he had returned from his visit to his native country, and delivered himself of his “Assembly Speech”^a there; an interval of nearly four months.^b The first, is addressed to his “Cousin” Spang, now styled “Reverend and Dear Brother,” and dated London, April 25th, 1645, but subscribed “Jamesone.” “It pleased God to give us a very prosperous journey. . . God brought us both^c to Edinburgh safe, . . on the

^a See back, p. 459.

^b One of his colleagues had on March 4th, 1644-5. written from London to Lady Kenmure, “There is nothing here but divisions in the Church and Assembly; for besides Brownists and Independents, who, of all that differ from us, come nearest to walkers with God, there are many other sects: . . all against the government by Presbyteries. Luther observed when he studied to reform, that two-and-thirty sects arose; of all which, . . except those called Seekers, who were not then arisen, he said, ‘God should crush them, and that they should rise again:’ both which, we see accomplished.” Rutherford’s Letters, Edit. 3, 1675, 16mo. Pt. iii. Let. 52, p. 76.—And in a Letter to Lady Boyd, placed next after the above without the date of the year, but written from London, May 25th, he says, “It pleaseth God that sometimes enemies hinder the building of the Lord’s house; but now friends, even gracious men, so I conceive of them, do not a little hinder the work. Thomas Goodwin, Jeremiah Burroughes, and some others, four or five, who are for the Independent Way, stand in our way, and are mighty opposites to Presbyterian government. . . Multitudes of Anabaptists, Antinomians, Familists, Separatists, are here; the best of the people are [of] the Independents’ way. . . The House of Peers are rotten men, and hate our Commissioners and our Cause both; the life that is, is in the House of Commons, and many of them also have their religion to choose.” *Ibid.* p. 77, 78. We take occasion to add, that Rutherford wrote to John Stuart, in 1637, “If I saw a call for New England, I would follow it.” *Ibid.* Pt. i. Let. 51, p. 119.

^c Himself and Gillespie.

Wednesday at night, the first day of the Assembly. I wanted not my fears of opposition in the Assembly to sundry things we had brought down. I would gladly have had time to have informed privately our friends of all things, before we had brought them in public. As for the changes in our [Scottish] church, I had laboured with my colleagues to have eschewed them all. . . The Belief in Baptism, was never said in England, and they would not undergo that yoke. When they urged, we could not deny but the saying [the Belief] by many was a fruitless and mere formality, and to others a needless weight; and that the saying the Commandments was no less unnecessary. We got the Assembly to equivalent Interrogatories, much against the mind of the Independents; and we were assured to have the Creed a part of the Catechism. All, both they and we, would gladly have been at the keeping still of Readers; for we foresaw the burden which the removal would bring on the Minister's back: but, after all our study, we could find no warrant for such an officer in the church; and to bring in a man to be the congregation's mouth to God, and God's mouth to the congregation, without a clear warrant of the Word, we saw the intolerable consequences of such a maxim. For Bowing in the Pulpit, . . it was . . so unanimously disused, that we were not able to make them alter. . . About the conclusion of the Psalm ["Glory be to the Father, etc.—As it was in the beginning, etc."] we had no debate with them; without scruple, Independents and all sang it, so far as I know, where it was printed at the end of two or three Psalms: but in the new translation of the Psalms, resolving to keep punctually to the original text, . . we and they were content to omit that; whereupon we saw both the Popish and Prelatical party did so much dote as to put it to the end of the most of their Lessons, and all their Psalms. . .

"On Thursday we were brought to the Assembly. I spake what you have in the enclosed. Mr. Gillespie spoke thereafter much to the same purpose. Because of the longing desire of all to know what we brought, and to deliver the minds of some from their fears lest we had other things than we at first would bring forth, all was presently read. . . All was heard with great applause, and contentment of all. . . The brethren from whom we expected most fashry [trouble] were easily satisfied: . . only Mr. And. R. was oft exceeding impertinent with his ostentation of antiquity, and Mr. D. Calderwood was oft fashious [troublesome] with his very rude and humorous opposition: yet we got them all at the last contented. . . There was no remedy, both of us were ordained with diligence to go back: so all that concerned myself in private and public went according to my mind. But for all this, my wine was incontinent mixed with much wormwood from sundry sinistrous accidents both in England and Scotland. The Independents, with Mr. Marshall's help, were very near to have carried by *canny* conveyance of some propositions in the matter of Church-censure, a fair and legal Toleration of their way; but their legerdemain being perceived was got crushed, to their small credit, and to the breakneck of that Accommodation betwixt us and them which was far advanced, but now by their schismatic practices, is made desperate. . .

"The English look on us already much more cheerfully than of late. . . Their new-modelled army consists for the most of raw, unexperienced, pressed soldiers. Few of the officers are thought capable of their places; many of them are sectaries, or their confident friends: if they do great service, many will be deceived. Some have great fears not only of their designs to strengthen the party of the Sectaries, . . but also of composing with the King, to the prejudice of us and all our friends here. . . We have great toil here in the Church-business. We are on the point of setting up Presbyteries and Synods in London; but all the ports of Hell are opened upon us. . . The most of the House of Commons are downright Erastians: they are like to create us much more woe than all the sectaries of England."^a

In "A Public Letter, London, April 25th," Baillie writes, "The Assembly hath now, I may say, ended the whole body of the Church-government, and that according to the doctrine and practice of the Church of Scotland, in everything material. . . The Independents, these six weeks, have not much troubled the Assembly; for after we had been a long time troubled with their opposition to all things, it was found meet to put them to declare their mind positively what they would be at. This they have shifted to this day, as, it was thought, not fully agreeing among themselves; but now being put peremptorily to it, they could not get it declined. Since, they have been about that task and we expect daily when they shall present to us their platform of church-government. The Assembly purposes [!] not to take it into public debate, but to give it to some committee, that they may frame an answer to it, if so it be found convenient. The Houses have past our votes of Government, purposing quickly to erect the Ecclesiastical Courts, of Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods; and thereafter to pass so much of our Government as they think necessary. We will [shall] have much to do with them to make sundry of our votes pass; for most of their lawyers are strong Erastians, and would have all the church-government depend absolutely on the Parliament: for this end they have passed a vote in the House of Commons, for appeals from sessions to presbyteries, from these to synods, from these to national assemblies, and from these to the Parliament. We mind to be silent for some time on this, lest we mar the erection of the ecclesiastic courts; but when we find it seasonable, we mind to make much ado before it go so. We are hopeful to make them declare, they mean no other thing by their appeals. . . than a complaint of an injurious proceeding; which we never denied. . . None need to talk of any fickleness or ingratitude of the English toward us, of any advancement of the Independent party; for no man here doubts but if once our army were in such a condition as easily, if we were diligent, might be, all these clouds would vanish, and we would [should] regain this people's hearts, and do with all Sectaries, and all things else, what we would. . . Our fears here who know how things go [politically], are great; yet we dare not think that God will desert his people and cause. Too much glory hath been spent on us these seven last years to be so easily lost."^b

^a Let. 93, vol. ii. p. 88—91, 95, 96.

^b Let. 94, p. 96—98, 100.

May 4th, he writes to Robert Ramsay, "If the Lord will be pleased to uphold our army, I believe we shall close all church-affairs shortly according to our mind, and easily call in the wantonness of the Sectaries; but the Lord save us from the rage of the roaring Malignants, and their crafty counsels, of which we are much afraid. . . Every day this month we have been expecting their [the Independents'] positive tenets, but as yet we have heard nothing of them; only in their sermons, in the city, they are deviating more and more towards old and new errors, especially liberty of conscience. Their ways are daily more and more disliked. . . We have these fourteen days been upon our advice to a sub-committee of the House of Commons, anent [concerning] the execution of our votes of Government: for it is the work of that sub-committee to draw two Ordinances; the one, for the practice of the Directory: . . for preachers, or writers, or publishers against it, were they Dukes and Peers, their third fault is the loss of all their goods, and perpetual imprisonment. The other Ordinance is for the erection of Ecclesiastical Courts over the whole kingdom. . . The City-ministers have sent them their unanimous advice,—for of a hundred and twenty-one city-ministers, there are not three Independents [!]
—for planting, just after our Scottish fashion, an eldership, etc. . . Herein the greatness of this nation forces them to differ from us, with our good liking: their Provincial assemblies cannot consist of all the ministers, but of so many delegated. . . for in sundry of their Provinces will be above six hundred churches, which would make at least twelve hundred members in a provincial synod; etc. . . Our next work will be the Confession and Catechism. . . If by any means we would [should] get these our regiments. . . to sixteen thousand marching men, by the blessing of God, in a short time we might ruin both the Malignant party and the Sectaries. The only strength of both these is the weakness of our army. . . If it please God to assist us but a little to be at this time serviceable, not so much to defend this people in their present danger, as to fight for Scotland in the midst of their land, at their charge, . . we may be assured of satisfaction for any wrong in word or deed that any of our friends pretend to have received, . . beside all the contentment we can desire of them in any matter either of church or state."^a

The Letter next in order is addressed to Spang, but is not dated. It is said therein, "The condition of our church-affairs is good. . . The Erastian party in the Parliament is stronger than the Independent, and is like to work us much woe. Selden is their head. If L'Empereur would beat down that man's arrogance, as he very well can, to show, out of the Rabbins, that the Jewish state was diverse from their church, and that they held the censure of excommunication among them, and a double Sanhedrim, one civil, another ecclesiastic, . . it would lay Selden's vanity."^b

June 10th, to "David Dickson" was sent a paper of instructions containing, among others, that, "You would [should] remonstrate, that the Independents' treating with Oxford is under trial, and that it

^a Let 95, p. 101,—105. ^b Let. 96, p. 105, 107.—Constantine L'Empereur, was Professor of Hebrew at Leyden.

is suspected it flows from their practice with the Queen by Harry Perry, of which we have been oft advertised.—You would [should] remonstrate, that this is the party whose principles and known constant carriage is to settle the State without any King at all; and so they are for the ruin of the whole royal family.—Beside, their dealing is utterly disliked by the body of the English, and the whole Scots. The Queen's entertainment of them will make her the more irreconcilable with the rest of both nations.—You would [should] assure the Queen's dealing with that party is to put the King in his old posture, to be guided by Digby and the Spanish faction; to have dependence on the Papists and Sectaries, who have need of liberty to be in a perpetual jealousy with the rest of his subjects; etc."^a

In the way of interrogation, Baillie wrote to "Mr. Cranford, June 17th," thus, in part; "How will you put on the Ordinance for Government, that else will linger? How will you provide Burton's and Goodwin's church? And if there be any more Independents, good they were removed by the Parliament before the Presbytery were erected.—What encouragement so hastened Bastwick Edwards to print Burroughes' Sermons, and his own tractates? also in the other books against Libertines?—How this plot, of capitulating with Oxford, may be found out?"^b

To "My Lord Lauderdale, June 17th," which was a busy day in Baillie's correspondence, he wrote, "I have been much fashed [troubled] in my own mind upon this occasion: an intercepted Letter of my lord Digby's bore, expressly, the offer of propositions to the King. As my custom was, I made a visit to Mr. Cranford; in the end, we fell to speak of that Letter in a free and friendly way. I was not well gone from him till, in the Exchange, he falls out very rashly and unprudently to comment upon that Letter, and to say little less than [that] some members of both Houses were banqueting with the King! Some of the Independents overhearing it, presently complain of it to the Committee of both Kingdoms. Harry Vane and the Solicitor exaggerate the matter and report it to the House of Commons. They sent for poor Mr. Cranford and examined him at their bar for some hours, and referred him after to a committee of Lords and Commons to free himself. He gives me up, as informer of much of his

^a Let 97, p. 108.—In a subsequent paper, No. 103, "Concerning Lord Savile's business," it is said "The privy way of treating was mightily confirmed by some Letters of intelligence written from France . . . which did contain the same articles, of giving content to the King concerning the militia, and delaying the church-business and all other matters, till his coming to London; and that it was moved to the Queen to deal for this effect with his Majesty, upon these considerations: That the Scots had no power here, and were averse from peace; that their opposites had all power in the Houses, in the City, in the army, and in the navy; That Presbyterian Government would be more powerful, permanent, and prejudicial to Monarchy and to the recovery of regal power in church-matters; but Independency being weak in itself and so near into disorder and confusion, would call quickly for a remedy, and open a way for the King to return to his own power; and that the one side was, in their principles, for liberty of conscience and therefore would be compliant with the Catholics of his Majesty's party in the three kingdoms; but the Presbyterians were more rigid, and would oppose toleration of divers religions in his Majesty's dominions." p. 127.

^b Let. 98, p. 109.

discourse, in a paper under his hand ; which the committee gave to our Commissioners, not requiring any answer. Yet, in duty, I thought it meet to give this enclosed answer to our Commissioners. . . It was the will of Cromwell in his Letter of his victory, to desire the House not to discourage those who had ventured their lives for them, and to come out expressly with their much-desired liberty of conscience. You will see the Letter in print by order, as I think, of the Houses."^a

The date of the foregoing, is placed upon a Letter "For Glasgow." It is now stated that "Our progress in the Assembly is but small. We fell in a labyrinth of a Catalogue of Sins for which people must be kept from the Sacrament, and ministers be deposed. When we had spent many days upon this, we found it was necessary to have . . . a general clause whereby the presbyteries and synods behoved to be intrusted with many more cases than possibly could be enumerated [!] . . . This accident [the battle of Naseby] is like to change much the face of affairs here. We hope the back of the Malignant party is broken. Some fear the insolency of others, to whom alone [!] the Lord has given the victory of that day."^b

On this same day, also, Spang is informed that "It is exceeding false that there has ever been the least appearance of discord betwixt our Commissioners and the Parliament, neither I hope ever shall be. What use the Independent party may make of this very great and entire victory, wherewith God has been pleased to bless these counsels which they took against the mind of most here, and by appearance against all reason, we cannot yet say. However, our danger was very great, and God now has made us secure from the Malignant party. . . I do not love Mr. Dane's motion : if it be his mind to draw from the Professors a declaration for our behoof, I think he would have proposed far other measures. I pray you see he do us no evil. Advertise Dr. Stewart to keep his colleagues silent, if they be not willing to declare flatly against all the branches of Independency [!] as Apollonius and Spanheim have done, and for the rooting out of all kinds of Episcopacy, according to our Covenant : why else should they trouble us with their untimorous declarations, who have trouble enough already in our great and dangerous wrestlings with the common enemy?"^c

"July 1st," is the date of a "Public Letter," in which Baillie says, "Order for the Directory . . . at last is past the House of Commons ; very near as severe an Ordinance as that against the neglect of the Service-book. . . What retardment we may have from this great victory [of Naseby] obtained most by the Independent party ; and what [from] that model of Government, whereupon Thomas Goodwin and his brethren these three months have been sitting so close that they very rarely, and he never at all has yet, appeared, we do not know ; only we expect a very sharp assault, how soon we know not, for a toleration to we wot not what. This we know, that we had never more need of your prayers for wisdom and grace to get the dangerous and evil designs of very crafty and diligent men overthrown, and turned on the head of the contrivers."^d

^a Let. 99, p. 110, 111.

^c Let. 102, p. 118.

^b Let. 100, p. 116, 117.

^d Let. 105, p. 133, 134.

Under the same date, "To my Lord Lauderdale," he wrote, "If you be a good Scotsman, remonstrate what necessity there is to make our army here strong: . . . for the time it is like to have little ado; for the Independents and Cromwell are like to put a quick end to all here without any other help."^a

Another "Public Letter," July 8th, states that "However our opposition is mighty, yet daily, blessed be God, we get ground. All the ministers in London now, without exception, are for our Presbytery. Thomas Goodwin and Burton, that were against it, are put, by the Parliament, from their places. Some other few preachers are but lecturers. The Independents yet present not their model: we suspect their domestic divisions, or their perplexity, whether to take in or hold out from amongst themselves the rest of the sectaries. . . . Let it be your care that Lauderdale be sent back to us with all expedition. No living man fitter to do service for Scotland against the plotting Independent party, which, for the time, has a great hand in the state."^b

"To the Earl of Eglintoun," July 8th, he communicates, "Yesterday we sent up to both Houses the whole body of the Church-government; so it is once out of the Assembly's hands. Blessed be God, all the ministers of London are for us. Burton and Goodwin, the only two that were Independents, are, by the Parliament, removed from their places. Seven or eight preachers that are against our way are only lecturers in the City, but not ministers. We hope shortly to get the Independents put to it, to declare themselves either to be for the rest of the Sectaries, or against them. If they declare against them, they will be but a small inconsiderable company; if for them, all honest men will cry out upon them for separating from all the Reformed Churches to join with Anabaptists and Libertines."^c

July 15th, superscribed "For my Lord Lauderdale," tells his lordship, "As yet our [Scottish] army here has done nothing: if its credit be not relieved with some successful action quickly, the clamours of this people will arise against it. Cromwell's extraordinary success makes that party here triumph. I wrote to you of Lord Digby's intercepted Letter. . . . A strange providence put in our hands three writs of Savile's hand which evidence his trafficking with Oxford by my Lord Say and the Independent party's advice. . . . The matter is so clear, that if it had been rightly timed, . . . by all appearance it had removed that party, which long has obstructed the Reformation both of church and kingdom: but their present favour with the City and all on their double victory, and our *neafeance* is so great that all that can be brought against them will not prejudice them. And indeed it seems they have altered a principle, that as, before [the retaking of] Leicester [June 17th] their trafficking was to bring back the King on very dangerous terms, so now, after their great success, it is to cast him clean away. Whatever miseries may follow, yet this conclusion would for once put all power in their friends' hands; but the God of justice and truth will not permit them to turn States at their pleasure!"^d

Now follow, three "Public Letters;" the only one dated, is the first,

^a Let. 106. p. 136.

^b Let. 107. p. 138, 139.

^c Let. 109. p. 142.

^d Let. 111 p. 145—147.

“ August 10th ;” and it records that “ The constant practice here, on the least appearance of any public danger, is to flee both to public and private fasting. Truly the godly here are a praying people, and the Parliament is very ready to further this disposition... Whatever the matter may be, . . my heart does not smite me for the wrong I know our nation has done, in lifting up arms against the Malignant party ;... for daily more and more it appears to the world that the design of the misled Court was and is, by all means out of hell, to fasten the yoke of tyranny on the necks both of our bodies and souls, for our times and the days of our posterity ; and therefore what we have done, we were absolutely necessitated to it.”^a

The second of these Public Letters contains the information that “ Since April we have not much been troubled with the Independents ; for since that time they have been about the model of their way, and have not much minded the Assembly ; and what they have done yet, all is a secret. Many think they cannot agree among themselves : but if we should be quit of them, we have no scant [scarcity] of Secretaries to the common cause. Paul Best, the antitrinitarian ;... Mr. Archer’s blasphemous book called ‘ The Author of the very Sinfulness of Sin ;’... Mr. Colman’s sermon to the House of Commons, the first fast day, exhorting them to keep all the Church-government in their own hand, and to give Churchmen none of it ; took up some days. . . The most part of the House of Commons, especially the lawyers, whereof there are many and divers of them very able men, are either half or whole Erastians, believing no church-government to be of Divine right, but all to be a human constitution, depending on the will of the magistrate ! About this matter we have had, at divers times, much bickering with them : now it is come to a shock... The Synod... after divers fair papers at last framed a most zealous, clear, and peremptory one, wherein they hold out plainly the Church’s divine right to keep off from the Sacrament all who were scandalous ; and if they cannot obtain the free exercise of that power which Christ hath given them, they will lay down their charges, and rather choose all afflictions than to sin by profaning the holy table. The House is highly inflamed with this Petition, and seems resolute to refuse it. The Assembly is as peremptory to have it granted... Affairs in Europe, these many ages, were not in a greater and more dangerous situation than at this hour. Our thoughts are that the Lord is shaking the foundations of kingdoms and states, to make way for the great propagation of the Gospel, which the godly here and elsewhere are expecting shortly, according to the Lord’s promise.”^b

The third “ Public Letter ” here, announces that “ We have been preparing our papers, for the satisfaction of the House, of our Divine right to keep scandalous persons from the holy table, and of our necessity to stand to a general rule for scandals, a particular enumeration being in itself impossible... Blessed be God, we gain ground on the minds of sundry of the Parliament.”^c

“ To Mr. William Spang, Aug. 15th,” occupies the next place in succession. In this, he is requested to see what he can do with Vossius

^a Let. 112. p. 147, 148.

^b Let. 113. 149—151.

^c Let. 114. p. 152.

to get him to answer Erastius' book; though Baillie expresses his "wish," that Vossius "had never meddled with the Independents" [!]^a

The next Letter finds and leaves Mr. Cranford "prisoner in the Tower of London."^b And after that, another to Spang, dated September 5th: "Send me the rest of Forbes. I like the book very well, and the man much the better for the book's sake. I marvel I can find nothing in its index against the Millenaries. . . I cannot dream why he should have omitted an error so famous in antiquity, and so troublesome among us; for the most of the chief divines here, not only Independents, but others, such as Twisse, Marshall, Palmer, and many more, are express Chiliasts. . . All here is in the balance. In the Assembly, we are going on languidly with the Confession of Faith and Catechism. The minds of the divines are much enfeebled by the House, their delay to grant the Petition,—a power to seclude from the table all scandalous persons, as well as some. Mr. Prynne and the Erastian lawyers are now our *remora*. The Independents and sects are quiet, enjoying peaceably all their desires, and increasing daily their party. They speak no more of bringing their model in the Assembly. We are afraid that this shameful and monstrous delay of building the Lord's house, and their [the Houses] ingratitude and unkindness to us in our deep sufferings for them, will provoke God against them [!] which we often earnestly deprecate; for their misery will be ours, and their welfare will profit all the Reformed Churches. I believe in time they will do all we desire. . . Mr. Cranford, on his first motion to the House, was let free. . . If our Scots affairs had not put such things out of our heads, we might have put Savile and others hard to it. The recruiting of the House, procured by the cunning and diligence of that party, what it will produce we are yet in doubt. Some think it will bring many favourers of Sectaries and Malignants into the House; some think otherwise."^c

October 14th, gives date to this "Public" Letter: "Great wrestling have we for the erecting of our Presbytery. It must be a Divine thing to which so much resistance is made by men of all sorts [!] yet, by God's help, we will very speedily see it set up, in spite of the devil. We have great difficulties on all hands; yet if the Lord continue to blink in mercy upon Scotland, they will diminish. [Public] affairs here, go, by God's blessing, so prosperously, that there is no more fear of the Malignant party. . . We were in a long expectation of a model from the Independents; but yesterday, after seven months' waiting, they have scorned us. The Assembly having put them to it to make a report of their diligence, they gave us in a sheet or two of injurious reasons, why they would not give us any reasons of their tenets. We have appointed a committee to answer that libel [Gloss. 'indictment']. We think they agree not among themselves, and that there are many things among them which they are loth to profess, which, by God's help, ere long I mind to do for them in their own words. But our greatest trouble, for the time, is from the Erastians in the House of Commons. They are at last content to erect Presbyteries and Synods in all the land, and have given out their Orders for

^a Let. 115. p. 154. ^b Let. 116. See back, p. 550. ^c Let. 117. p. 156, 158.

that end ; yet they give to the Ecclesiastic Courts so little power, that the Assembly finding their Petitions not granted, are in great doubt whether to set up anything till, by some powerful Petition of many thousand hands, they obtain some more of their just desires. The only mean to obtain this and all else we desire, is [to bring up] our recruited [Scots] army about Newark : the inlacks [wants] of that army, is the earthly fountain of all our difficulties here."^a

About the same day, and in the same month, Baillie writes to Mr. George Young, "Rev. and Dear Brother, . . . Our hearts here are oft much weighted and wounded by many hands. Our wrestlings with devils and men are great. However, the body of this people be as good as any people, yet they that rule all are much opposite to our desires. Some very few, guide all now at their pleasure, only through the default of our army [!] For this long time they have not trusted us ; but have had their secret fear of our colluding with the King. . . . The faction that here prevails, minding liberty of conscience, and finding it impossible to gain us to oversee that so great a fault, have made that their work,—to be quit of us ! They have occasioned many provocations, to vex us, and make us vex others. I cannot write the half of their proud and unjust dealings. The miscarriage of our army they exaggerate. We say, by their withdrawing all the promised pay the seven last months, not giving one month's pay, [they] have forced us to take by violence for our subsistence, and disabled us to do any service, of purpose to make us odious ; that their own army, which they have put in the hand only of Sectaries, or their confident friends, they have furnished with men and money every fortnight, and were sure in all enterprises to have it ever the stronger ; so that it was an easy matter for them to do all their services and be cried up. The Assembly is much discouraged : they find their advice altogether slighted ; a kind of —— Presbytery set up ; sects daily springing over all the land, without any care at all to restrain them ; a clear aim in the prevailing party to have a liberty universal ; an utter dislike of our nation for opposing their designs ; and driving it so high, that ways are studied, if no better may be, to break the union of the nations, and have us, for the carriage [practices] of our army, declared, the first breakers, to them, and dealt with as such ! . . . We cry to God, who knows the honesty of our hearts, and the dishonesty of theirs ; the cause of our engagement and our huge suffering ; their great ingratitude to us, and our great patience to them [!] It is gone already very high. We fear that they make Digby seem to deal with us, while they in truth know how to get the King from us to themselves on their own terms ; and, if we be not willing to compone in what terms both for religion and state they please, to cast us off ; and for the recompence of all our labours, to turn on our poor, broken, distressed country, the armies of both. The best way we know to prevent this, is to haste up our army, well recruited and disciplined, to Newark, having cashiered all who are the known instruments of debauchery, or can be proven to have kept correspondence with the enemy. This, in spite of the Independent plots, would help all : for

^a Let. 118, p. 159—161.

the body of the Parliament, city, and country, are for the Presbytery, and love us, and hate the Sectaries; but are all outwitted and overpowered by a few, whom the service and activeness of our army would undo. . . But of these things, much more than I purposed; only I thought good to let you know the *inside* of our affairs. . . These things to you only, and Mr. David [Dickson], and to whom you think expedient. . . Mr. Samuel [Rutherford] and Mr. George [Gillespie] are busy with the press, and I will [shall] be so for one five or six weeks thereafter."^a

Spang is informed, October 17th, "To clear our reputation, we have printed some of our late papers to satisfy the ignorance of the people: in answer to our last paper, the House of Commons have passed sundry very strange and unkind votes, wherewith the Lords have yet refused to concur. . . Jamesone."^b

Another Letter to Spang, seven days later, acquaints him that, "Unhappily, Amyraut's Questions are brought in our Assembly. Many more love these fancies here than I expected. It falls out ill, that Spanheim's book is so long acoming out, while Amyraut's treatise goes in the Assembly from hand to hand; yet I hope this shall go right. The City and Assembly are on a better way than before, to make the Parliament for more liberty to suspend from the table scandalous persons, than they would willingly grant. . . My piece against the Independents is on the press."^c

November 6th, of this year, 1645, the "Committee for Accommodation," first appointed Sept. 13th, 1644, was revived by Order of both Houses; the Lords' committee consisting of the Earls of Northumberland and Manchester, with Viscount Say and Seale, Lord Wharton, and Lord Howard. The Assembly's Committee were at this time, Marshall, Burgess, White, Hoyle, Temple, Smith, Palmer, Seaman, Herle, Goodwin, Nye, Bridge, Hill, Reynolds, Arrowsmith, Young, Vines, Tuckney, Newcomen, Simpson, Burroughes, Dury. Those Committees, with the Scots Commissioners, met on Monday, the 14th, in the Jerusalem chamber, and re-appointed those "who had formerly been a sub-committee for that purpose," to "consider and prepare matter" for debate at another meeting on the 24th. That day, the chairman of the sub-committee, Vines, reported, That they had not prepared, as they were instructed, "because the Dissenting Brethren," the Independents, "did waive the first part of the Order," touching Accommodation;^d and that those Brethren were left by the rest, to present their thoughts to this Committee; "not as the result of the sub-committee, but as their own." The Independents accordingly gave in as follows: "The nature of the business puts us upon the second part of the Ordinance of Parliament, 'The endeavouring to find out some way how far tender consciences, etc., may be borne with.' . . Which," said they, "we humbly present to the consideration of this Committee." Whereupon it was resolved, That Masters Goodwin, Nye, Simpson, Bridge, and Burroughes, bring in "upon Thurs-

^a Let. 119, p. 161—164.

^b Let. 120, p. 165.

^c Let. 121, p. 166, 167.—For Amyraut, see Biog. Universelle. 1811. 8vo. Tome 2, p. 81, 82.

^d See back, p. 447.

day seven-night, wherein they *desire* to be borne with in point of Church Government."^a

A "Public" Letter of Baillie's, November 25th, reports that "In the Assembly, we are going on with the Confession of Faith. We had long and tough debates about the decrees of Election; yet thanks to God all is gone right according to our mind. That which has taken up much of the Assembly's time and mind, these six or seven weeks, is their manifold Petitions to the Parliament for a full liberty to keep from the holy table all scandalous persons. The Parliament calls this an arbitrary power, and requires the Assembly to make an express enumeration of all the sins for which they intend to censure. After many returns, we gave them in an enumeration of many particulars, but withal [it] craves a general clause to be added... The ministers refuse to accept of presbyteries without this power. . . We are now hot on the Committee for Accommodation. I tell my mind freely of it in my preface to my 'Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time,' which is now abroad. . . The Independents, in their last meeting of our Grand Committee of Accommodation, have expressed their desires for Toleration, not only to themselves but to other sects [!] The Parliament has no great inclination to satisfy either. What may come of this, we know not; only it were our heart's desire that our army at Newark were recruited [!]"^b

He tells Spang, November 29th; "I have sent you seven of my 'Dissuasives.' . . I expect a shower of Independents about my ears, but I am not [a] feared: I have a reserve of more stories, and I think they will have more to do shortly, for their elusory denial to the Assembly of their model they caused print [to be printed] under the name of a 'Remonstrance,' to which the Assembly has made a large and sharp 'Answer,'^c which lays them more even; also, their rejecting of all accommodation, and pleading for a Toleration not only of their separate churches but for the other sects, gives great offence, and will draw out bitter writs quickly against them. . . Will you entreat Dr. Forbes to press his friend Vossius to print that he told me he had ready against the Anabaptists, the greatest and most prevalent sect here: in tumultuous ways they provoke our chief ministers to public disputations for Pædobaptism."^d

The next, is also to Spang, but without date. "The first impression of my 'Dissuasive' is away already. It is going again to the press. I get thanks for it from many. I wish you might put Forbes to go on with his history, especially of the Anabaptists, Libertines, and such as presently vex us. . . These [the Anabaptists] and the Sectaries also most increase amongst us. Tombes, a minister of London, has printed a large book for them, wherein he dares us all. . . Some six or seven weeks ago, the humour of the faction who guides here, towards

^a From p. 12—15, of "The Papers and Answers of the Dissenting Brethren and [the rest of] the Committee of the Assembly of Divines: given in to the Honourable Committee of Lords and Commons and Assembly of Divines with the Scotch Commissioners, for Accommodation; at the Revising of that Committee: 1645. Printed, 1648." 4to. pp. 123.

^b Let. 122, p. 168, 169. ^c 1645. 4to. pp. 24. ^d Let. 123, p. 169, 170.

us seemed not to be friendly. . . We were content to have the Committee for Accommodation renewed for our opposition to their designs: in this, was the main fountain of their evil talent against us: . . . we would, for peace's cause, dispense with them in very many things, but they are peremptory, they will not hear nor speak of any accommodation, but they will, by all means, have their separate churches. They plead for a Toleration to other sects as well as to themselves; and with much ado could we get them to propone [propound] what they desired to themselves. At last they gave us a paper: . . . in our answer, we flatly denied such a vast liberty, and backed it with reasons, and withal are begun to show what indulgence we could, for peace' sake, grant. Here Mr. Marshall, our chairman, has been their most diligent agent to draw too many of us to grant them much more than my heart can yield to, and which to my power I oppose. As yet, we are not come to express our rash bounty, and some things have intervened from God that I hope will stay the precipitancy of some whom I expected should have been more opposite to all toleration of separate congregations than, when it comes to a *chock*, [brunt] I found them: 1. Thomas Goodwin, the last meeting, declared publicly that he cannot refuse to be members—nor censure, when members—any for Anabaptism, Lutheranism, or any errors which are not fundamental, and maintained against knowledge, according to the principle in the Apologetic. This ingenuous and most timeous albeit merely accidental profession, has much allayed the favour of some to their Toleration. 2. Some good friend has informed [of] the City-ministers that they, in their meeting at Sion College, have resolved unanimously to petition the Assembly against all such tolerations. 3. The other day Say and Wharton moved in the House of Lords, to adjourn—that is, really to dissolve—the Assembly. 4. The Independents are stickling too openly to have the Common Council of London modelled to their mind. 5. Instead of their long-expected model, they presented a libel of invectives as reasons why they would present no model to the Assembly: this, underhand, they caused print; and when the Assembly had drawn up a sober and true answer, and got an order from the House of Lords to print it, they make their friends in the House of Commons as yet to keep it in. All these are alarms to make us, if we be not demented [distracted] as many the best men here are, to be the more wary of their toleration.”^a

An undated “Public Letter” contains these remarks, that “God has helped us to get the body of the ministry of all the land to be cordially for us, and the City is now striking in; which we hope shall carry it, and get up a *straighter* Government, and also exclude toleration of sects more than many men here do desire! We have had many bickerings with the Independents in the Grand Committee about an indulgence for their separate congregations. . . For this point, both they and we contend *tanquam pro aris et focis*. Had it been God's will to have made our army here this last year successful, we should have had few debates for any of our desires; but the calamities of our country [Scotland] and weakness of our army, make the sects and their friends bold, and very insolent.”^b

^a Let. 124, p. 170—172. ^b Let. 125, p. 174, 175.

To Spang, undated: "Matters are near some crisis. I pray God it may be happy. I count the King's party utterly undone... London is not willing to quit what both parliaments [Scotch and English] granted to them before, and therefore did offer petition upon petition to have their own militia, as in the propositions agreed to by both kingdoms was settled. The Lords were willing to let it go so: the Commons, foreseeing that such a power in the hands of London, though under the Parliament, yet makes them masters of the Parliament; also gives them power over the city of Westminster and all the suburbs, which they had not before; so demur upon the matter, and are content to hear the contrary petitions of Westminster and the suburbs, which may draw the business of the propositions to so great a length as they please. In the mean time, the King's extremity makes him very impatient of such delays. The City is much grieved that what before was without a question granted to them, should now be taken away. This controversy makes them the more willing to look into the ways of the Sectaries... The City is in so good a temper these two months as we could wish... The Sectarian party would gladly be at a breach with us; but the affection which France and the City declares towards us, does a little bridle them."^a

In a "Public Letter, December 2nd," these incidentals appear, "Our army [of Scots] is come to Newark... The Independents here plead for a Toleration both for themselves and other sects. My 'Dis-suasive' is come in time to do service here. We hope God will assist us to remonstrate the wickedness of such a Toleration... An 'Accommodation,' in just terms, we were well content with; but the Independents always scorned it. Yet ere long I think they will beg it when it will not be granted."^b

Then follows a Letter headed "For Mr. Roberts," but without a date: "Reverend and Beloved Brother,... Yesterday the Assembly's Petition was frowned upon in both Houses; notwithstanding, we purpose, God willing, on Thursday to give in a remonstancie of a more full and high strain... I heard yesterday, that Mr. Lilburn has a Petition for the Sectaries, subscribed with the hands of a great many thousands... If your city will countenance Mr. Peter's sermon on the day appointed, they do but go on as they have begun. Send back this letter with the bearer; for we had need to beware what papers be in any of your studies, since, the other day, it was earnestly pressed in the House that Mr. Jenkins', Mr. Cranford's, and, as I think, Mr. Fisher's studies should be presently sealed up, and searched. These be but the beginnings of evils."^c

^a Let. 126. p. 176—178. ^b Let. 127. p. 178, 179. ^c Let. 138. p. 179, 180.

CHAP. LXII.

COTTON'S "WAY OF THE CHURCHES."— "ANIMADVERSIONS" UPON
COTTON'S "KEYS" AND "WAY."—HIS DEFENCE.

FOR another contribution necessary to the obtaining of a full and correct insight into the opinions and practices of our ancestors, we resort to "The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England: Or, The Way of Churches walking in Brotherly Equality, or Co-ordination, without Subection of one Church to another: Measured and examined by the Golden Reed of the Sanctuary. Containing a full Declaration of the Church-Way in all particulars. By Mr. J. Cotton, Teacher of the Church at Boston in New England.—Published according to Order. Lond. 1645." 4to. pp. 116.

The Epistle to the Reader, "satisfying,"—say they who superintended the passing this treatise through the press,— "his desire of a fuller declaration of the Church-Way," commences with remarking that "Although our Brethren of a different judgment from that Way, have not, all this while, held forth unto us what Discipline they intend; nor yet have pointed us to any Platform settled in adjacent kingdoms; but rather have lured off our eye with intimations that they intend some variation; yet how many [times], how long [time], have [they] even dulled our ears with expostulations for a 'fuller declaration' of ourselves, whose hands they know are much bound up, and our single selves in an incapacity to be representative of others! The unwillingness of Licensers to license our tracts; and the earnest endeavours of some to move complaints against two or three of our most moderate books, that with hard travail got a convoy of licences to cut through the presses, are not dumb witnesses how much our way is barred, and our hands tied short. . .

"With much ado, we have presented you with a fuller 'declaration' of all our Way, according to the Scriptures, in this learned yet modest treatise. . . If all things in this treatise as now printed, do not answer punctually word for word to the first written copy, let the reverend author, and the candid reader, pardon us. . . Lest any should imagine that every thing in the 'Keys' doth not fit all the wards in this treatise to a hair, we will here insert Mr. Cotton's own words. . . coming. . . while this Epistle lay under the Press, namely, 'If you think the draft of Church-Discipline^a which was sent over in your ship, varieth from that of 'The Power of the Keys'^b sent over the year after; you may have some occasion so to conceive, from some difference of expression in logical terms, but not a jot in any doctrine of divinity, or church-practice. . . To Mr. R. M.' Divers objections, formerly, laid against the printing of this book, to the saddening of the author; some whereof are now answered by the late season of printing it; others by the necessity of them that conscientiously and candidly cry out for

^a See back, p. 155.

^b See back, p. 259.

information; others, by the foreprinting of the 'Keys' to open the full mind and whole sphere of the author's judgment in this; others, by that putting forth in print of an answer to this book, before this was midwifed by the Press into the world; all reason therefore, now it can speak, that it should answer for itself.".. Signed, N. H.—I. H.^a

We shall not handle this profound treatise with any regard to method, since to do it ample justice would occupy far more space than can be allotted for it in these pages. The chapters consist of 1. "The order of gathering dispersed Christians into a Church." 2. "Touching Church-officers, with their election and ordination." 3. "Of the addition of Members to the Church." 4. "Concerning our Order and Forms in administration of God's Public Worship." 5. "Touching the dispensation of the Censures of the Church." 6. "Seven ways of Communion of Churches." And, 7. "Of the way of Reformation in the Congregations in England."

Concerning the vexata quæstio which has caused so much strife among disputants on church-order and discipline, Cotton writes, at this time, in this somewhat ambiguous strain: "Neither do we acknowledge 'Ruling Elders,' 1 Tim. v. 17, in the church, to be lay-elders properly; for to say nothing of the distinction between the clergy and laity, which is of a later edition than apostolic times, the ruling elders being ordained to the office by the election of the people and imposition of hands—as well as the preaching elders,—they are no more laymen, or private christians, than the teachers or pastors are lay-ministers: and though the pastor and teacher be either of them church-rulers, yet the ruler is here distinguished from them, as a distinct member attending to his action of rule as his proper function."^b "The issue of all," he adds, after further remarks, "is, that when men of learning and judgment have wearied their wits and strength to shoulder out 'Ruling Elders' from this text, yet such is the evidence and wisdom of the Holy Ghost, in the Word, that it may well appear 'the weakness of God is stronger than men,' and 'the foolishness of God wiser than men.'^c The words cannot but approve two sorts of Elders, and both 'worthy of double honour,' both they that 'rule well,' though they labour not in preaching, and 'especially' they that do labour in preaching; but this interpretation will by no means satisfy some of a contrary judgment."^d "We utterly deny them to be 'laymen,' as the word is commonly meant in this controversy; but church-officers, set apart to their office by the election of the people and by imposition of hands; but if they were mere laymen—which they are not,—yet you see it is no 'strange' or 'unheard of' matter, that churches should be bountiful to the maintenance of sundry sorts of church-rulers who are merely laymen, as their adversaries misconceive these to be... But the world will love its own, be there never so many idle drones or stately 'rulers' of man's own devising, the Church must supply them not only with maintenance, but with magnificence; but let the Lord appoint 'ruling elders,' according to the simplicity of the Gospel, to assist his ministers in the work of government, that they might attend

^a Nathaniel Homes subscribed the Epistle prefixed to "The Way of Congregational Churches *Cleared*. 1648."

^b P. 14.

^c 1 Cor. i. 25.

^d P. 24.

the more to 'labour in the Word,' if they shall expect from the Church any 'maintenance' for their work's sake, oh! that seemeth a 'strange' matter, and 'unheard of'^a from all antiquity, till this present age."^b

To an objection, in part, that in 1 Tim. iv. 14, the presbytery gave imposition of hands to ordain ministers; but lay-elders had no right to impose hands to that purpose, therefore laymen were none of this "presbytery;" it is answered, "When it is said, No man can give what he hath not received;—the light of nature, the law of Moses, the Gospel of Christ, do all of them make a ready answer for us. The law of nature tells us it is not necessary that they that give should always, formally, have beforehand received that power which they give: it is enough if they have received it virtually. For instance, a multitude of free people may elect and ordain a king over them; and yet none of them had, beforehand, received kingly power: it is enough, they have a virtual power to set up and to submit unto any lawful form of government which they see good for themselves in the land. The people of Israel, to wit, some in the name of the rest, for all could not at once,—'impose their hands upon the Levites,'^c and yet were not Levites themselves, nor had received imposition of hands themselves, and yet may nevertheless impose hands upon others. In the Gospel of Christ, the power of 'the keys' is given to the church—to Peter, not as an apostle nor as an elder, but as a professed believer, in the name of believers, and upon occasion of the profession of his faith;^d whereupon the binding and loosing—which is *the power* of the keys—is attributed to the whole 'church' Matt. xviii. 17, 18. If then, the power of the keys, which is the whole body of church-power, be given to the body of the church, though it be not in their power to exercise their pastoral preaching of the Word and administering of the sacraments, yet it is in their power to elect such whom God hath furnished with gifts among them, unto such offices as may dispense all the holy things of God to them; and, by imposition of hands, to dedicate them to God and to the public service of his church. Now, if the whole church have this power to impose hands upon their officers in their first ordination, how can it seem a 'strange' and 'unheard-of' thing, or on absurd matter, that Ruling Elders should together with the Pastors and Teachers—all of them making up the 'presbytery' of the church—impose hands, in the Name of the Lord, and of the church, upon the ordained?"^e

"It is well known," Cotton says, "to all such as are studious of antiquity, that it was counted a rare and insolent matter for an Elder to preach in the presence of a Bishop! Which was the cause why the good old Bishop Valerius was hardly spoken of, for suffering Augustine a Presbyter—though a learned Presbyter—to preach before him; which, is said, never any African Bishop had allowed, before him. Now, whence should such an offence as was taken against Valerius arise, but from translating the silence of Ruling Elders from preaching in the presence of Pastors and Teachers, unto those Presbyters also who were called often to preach the Word freely and diligently, as well as the Bishops themselves? But when, through

^a "Bishop Bilson."

^b P. 25, 26.

^c Num. viii. 10.

^d Matt. xvi. 16—19.

^e P. 26.

corruption of times, Bishops claimed to themselves the principal pastoral cure of souls, then it was taken for an offensive matter that Teaching Elders should preach before them; as before, it was unwonted for Ruling Elders to preach before the Teaching, ordinarily."^a

He meets an objection of "some learned and prudent men," thus, "It is not credible that the office of ruling elders should be of divine or apostolical institution, and no footsteps left of it . . . for these many hundred years"; by inferring, that in "churchwardens and vestry-men" are "some footsteps and remnants, and as it were *rudera*, of that holy and ancient ordinance, so much as is escaped out of the ruins of anti-christian apostacy. . . . What other thing soundeth the very name of 'church-wardens'—*guardiani ecclesiæ*, but church-guardians or church-rulers? and, what is the company of 'vestrymen,' but a kind of a consistory?"^b Of his own "knowledge," he states, "there be some peculiar, privileged, churches in England, exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishop and his officers, where the church-wardens and ministers either by themselves, or with the consent of the congregation, do transact all that government which in other churches the bishop and his officers do invade and usurp; as to admonish offenders, to enjoin acknowledgment of scandalous offences, and to debar from the sacraments, etc. And by this means, they repress idleness, drunkenness, swearing, sabbath-breaking, and the like disorders, with better success than other towns can do who have the help of mayor and justices." So that, "it may not obscurely appear, that anciently they did enjoy it—spiritual power—amongst themselves, before one church began to lord it over another."^c

"Deacons," we are told, "all men acknowledge," to have continued throughout all ages, "though not without sundry mixtures of corruptions in the practice, . . . which is impertinent to our purpose to prosecute who only intend to declare and clear our own practice and proceedings. Deacons therefore we reserve in our churches, but without distinction of pre-eminence of some of them above others; much less over the ministers and elders. Neither do we employ them about the ministry of the Word, nor about the government of the church. . . . We do not appoint them to go up and down to collect the benevolences of abler brethren, but as the apostles received the oblations of the brethren, 'brought, and laid down' at their feet, Acts iv. 34, 35, and thereby made 'distribution' as the *χρεία*, 'use,' of the church required: . . . they receive the oblations of the brethren every Lord's-day, brought unto them and laid down before them, or else brought unto them on the week-day; and distribute the same as the use and 'need' of the church doth require."^d

"Widows," 1 Tim. v. 9, 10, "we look at them as fit assistants to the deacons in ministering to the sick poor brethren in sundry needful services which are not so fit for men: . . . only we find it somewhat rare to find a woman of so great an age . . . fit to undertake such a service."^e

"When . . . churches are destitute of any of these officers, the 'brethren . . . look out from amongst themselves' such persons. . . . Elders, according to 1 Tim. iii. 2—7; Tit. i. 6—9: Deacons, according to Acts vi. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 8—12: for the church hath not absolute power to

^a P. 33.^b P. 33, 34.^c P. 35.^d P. 38.^e P. 39.

choose whom they list, but ministerial power only to choose whom Christ hath chosen. . . If the church can find out none such in their own body, they send to any other church for a fit supply ; and each church looketh at it as their duty to be mutually helpful . . in yielding what supply they may without too much prejudice to themselves, according to Sol. Song, viii. 8, 9. Such being recommended, . . they take some time of trial of them ; . . to fulfil the command of the apostle, 1 Tim. v. 22. . . When . . the church doth find every man's spirit among them desirous of the fellowship of the man and his gifts ; then they agree . . upon a certain day wherein . . to elect him to office. . . Of this, they give notice to all the near adjoining churches, . . entreating their presence, and brotherly counsel and assistance. . . They give notice also thereof unto the governor, and such other of the magistrates as are near to them ; that the person to be chosen, meeting with no just exception from any, may find the greater encouragement and acceptance from all.

“ When the day is come, it is kept as a day of humiliation, with fasting, praying, and preaching the Word, according to the pattern, Acts xiv. 23 ; xiii. 1—3. Towards the end of the day, one of the elders of the church, if they have any, if not, one of the graver brethren of the church appointed by themselves to order the work of the day, standeth up and inquireth of the church, ‘ If now, after this solemn seeking of God for his counsel and direction in this weighty work, they still continue in their purpose to elect ’ such a one, for their own pastor, or teacher, or ruling-elder, whom before they agreed upon. Then, having taken their silence for a consent to their purpose, he proceedeth to inquire in toall the approbation of the rest of the assembly, . . and that stand by ; because an elder is to be a man of ‘ good report of them that are without,’ 1 Tim. iii. 7 ; how much more, well approved of the churches of Christ ! He demandeth therefore, of the churches first, and then of the rest, ‘ Whether any of them have known of any evil in the man presented before them, either in judgment or practice, which might give them just cause to forbear his election ? ’ If all keep silence—as usually they do, for if any have just exception against the man, he is wont to acquaint some or other of the church with it before the day,—he turneth himself to the church again. Now, seeing all is clear, . . he desireth all the brethren of that church to declare their election . . with one accord, by lifting up their hands : which being done, he desireth to know of the party chosen, Whether he doth accept of that calling ? . . He having expressed his acceptance, upon such grounds as wherein he hath chiefly seen the hand of God leading him thereunto ; the Elder doth then admonish the church what duties the Lord requireth of them all in his Word towards him whom they have thus chosen ; and afterwards, advertiseth him, what duties the Lord requireth of him in that place towards the church. And having taken the acknowledgments of them both of their mutual duty ; . . he then with the Presbytery of that church, if they have any ; if not, two or three others of the gravest Christians amongst the brethren of that church, being deputed by the body ; do, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, ordain him unto that office with imposition of hands, calling upon the

Lord . . to accept and own him therein ; to enlarge his heart and spirit according to all the duties thereof ; to breathe in all his administrations, and to guide and bless all his going out and coming in before them. And so, turning his speech upon the person on whom their hands are imposed, he, as the mouth of the Presbytery, expresseth their ordination of him to that office in the Name of the Lord Jesus, etc. After this, the elders of their churches present, observing the presence of God both in the duties of that day performed, etc. one of them, in the name of all the rest, doth give unto him ‘the right hand of fellowship’^a in the sight of all the assembly ; testifying their brotherly acceptance of him, etc. ; and doth exhort him in the Lord, to fulfil the ministry which he hath received of the Lord : and so, after public praise given to God by him, in the name of the church, he dissolveth the assembly with a blessing.”^b

For “our calling” of Deacons, “we hold it not necessary,” Cotton remarks, “to ordain them with like solemnity . . as of Elders ;” because no precedent appears in Acts vi. But men “fitly qualified,” and having been “proved,”^c the elders upon some Lord’s-day, or other public holy meeting, “appoint them over that ‘business,’^d with prayer and imposition of hands.”^e

The warrants for the people’s, or church’s, share in those proceedings are deduced from Acts i. 15, 23, 26 ; xiv. 23 ; vi. 3, 5 : Matt. xvi. 19 ; xviii. 18.^f

Then follow sections concerning “The church the subject of ecclesiastical power.—Diocesan bishops, not an ecclesiastical power :—nor by Divine institution.—Presbyters of other churches may help by counsel, not by authority.”^g

“The first and lowest number of a church . . is not expressly limited in the Word ; only it is not so low as some have conceived. . . But the church must needs be a greater number than ‘two or three,’ seeing these two or three, Matt. xviii. 20, are to refer the person and the cause to a greater body than themselves. For though there might be a domestical church in Adam and Eve at the beginning, yet such a church which Christ hath instituted in the New Testament consisteth of a greater number. The very officers of a church completely furnished, are no less than four—a pastor, a teacher, an elder, a deacon,—and therefore the body . . had need to be of a greater number. . . And though the essence of a church may consist without the integrity of all her members,—as a man that wanteth some of his members may have the essence of a man,—yet under seven a church can hardly consist of so many members as do perform any part of a church-body. To such a body, how many members may be added, is not limited expressly in the Word, only . . that they be no more than that all may meet in one congregation ; . . Cor. xiv. 23 : but if all cannot hear, all cannot be edified ; ver. 26. Besides . . 1 Cor. xi. 33. . . When the hive is too full, bees swarm into a new hive ; so should . . Christians issue forth into more churches.

“They that desire to be added and joined to such a body, . . make

^a Gal. ii. 9.

^b P. 39—42.

^c 1 Tim. iii. 10.

^d Acts vi. 3, 6.

^e P. 42.

^f P. 42, 43.

^g P. 43—52.

known their desires to the Elders ; . . who take trial of their knowledge in the principles of religion, and of their experience in the ways of grace, and of their godly conversation amongst men, that if . . found ignorant, etc. *such* may not be presently presented to the church. . . But when . . approved of the Elders, they are propounded by one of the ruling-elders to the church : . . if no exception be heard of, they are called forth before the church . . and each one maketh confession of his sins, and profession of his faith. . . Now, before or after such his profession, etc., those of the brethren of the church who are of his acquaintance do give some good testimony, if need be, of his life and conversation ; either according to their own knowledge of him, or according to the credible reports, or letters, which they have received : which done, the ruling-elder, or one of the preaching-elders, propoundeth it to the church, Whether from all that they have heard and seen, they find any just exception ? . . If so, it is cleared and removed before any further proceedings : if no just exception appear, the ruling-elder then moveth the church to express their acceptance . . by lifting up their hands. Which done, and the like course taken with two or three more as the time will permit, the elder propoundeth to them the heads of the covenant which the Lord hath made with his church, What promises of grace He hath made to them ; as also, What duties of faith and obedience He doth require of them—as, to take the Lord Jesus for their only Priest and atonement ; their only Prophet and Guide ; their only King and Lawgiver ; and to walk in professed subjection unto all His Holy ordinances ; as also, to walk in brotherly love with the brethren of this church, unto mutual edification and succour, according to the rule of the Gospel.—And the new received members acknowledging this, to be their duty ; and professing their consent unto it, in the Name of Christ ; the elder doth further acquaint them with what duties of holy watchfulness over them, they may expect from the church : and so shutteth up his work with some short prayer unto the Lord, etc.”^a

“ Now,” inquires Cotton,, “ What offence is there in all this ? . . First ; That we require gracious qualifications : . . whereas the visible church is said to consist of all sorts ; . . a garner containing chaff and wheat ; . . a field, wherein wheat and tares grow up together. Secondly ; That we receive such into the church by a covenant. Thirdly ; That we communicate too much power unto the people. . . For the first ; though we willingly admit all comers, to the *hearing* of the Word with us—as the Corinthians admitted ‘ infidels,’^b—yet we receive none as *members* into the church but such as—according to the judgment of charitable Christians—may be conceived to be received of God into fellowship with Christ, the Head of the Church. Our reasons be first, From the near relation between Christ Jesus and the church : . . the visible church, is ‘ the body of Christ Jesus :’^c . . the ‘ habitation of God by the Spirit :’^d . . ‘ the temple,’ etc. :^e ‘ espoused’ to Christ as ‘ a chaste virgin.’^f The members of the visible church, are said to be the ‘ sons and daughters,’ ect. ;^g ‘ followers of God, as dear chil-

^a P. 53—55.^b 1 Cor. xiv. 23, 24.^c 1 Cor. xii. 27.^d Eph. ii. 22.^e 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.^f 2 Cor. xi. 2.^g 2 Cor. vi. 18.

dren :^a . . ‘ saints, by calling ;’ and ‘ faithful brethren.’^b . . Secondly ; . . ‘ such as should be saved ;’^c and how then shall we ‘ add to the church,’ such as God addeth not ? . . Doth not the apostle Paul, upon this ground, direct the Romans to ‘ receive’ a weak believer, because the Lord ‘ hath received him ?’^d Thirdly ; The Lord Jesus maketh the profession of the faith of his Name, etc. to be the ‘ rock’ on which his visible church is built :^e . . now, if such a profession be the rock and foundation of a visible church, then we shall [should] build a church without a foundation if we receive such members . . as do not hold forth such a profession ! . . And doth not the Lord expostulate with such a ‘ guest’ as comes . . even unto His table, ‘ not having a wedding garment ?’ and doth not expostulation intimate a taxation also of them by whose connivance he came in, where He saith, ‘ How camest thou in hither ?’^f And doth not Christ . . impute it to the sleepiness, that is, to the remissness and negligence, of his ‘ servants,’ that ‘ tares’ were sown in his field ‘ amongst the wheat ?’^g Fourthly ; Such as have only ‘ a form of godliness’ and deny ‘ the power of it,’ we are forbidden to join with, and commanded to ‘ turn’ from them.^h Fifthly ; Can any man judge such persons fit materials for the constituting and edifying of a church, who are more fit for the ruin, etc., of the church ? . . We pass by the types of the Old Testament, which yet are not without their due weight . . Well then ! if all the members . . ought to be ‘ saints,’ by calling ; and ‘ faithful brethren ;’ it cannot be thought an unseasonable curiosity, etc., to take a due trial of men by a confession of sins, as John Baptist did ;ⁱ and by a profession of their faith, as Philip did ;^k before they receive them ? . . Nevertheless, in this trial, we do not exact eminent measure either of knowledge or holiness ; but do willingly stretch out our hands to receive the ‘ weak’ in faith, . . for we had rather ninety-nine hypocrites should perish through presumption, than one humble soul belonging to Christ should sink under discouragement or despair.”^l

The further strictures, of the covenant, and the people’s power,^m must give place to matter relating to practical procedure.

“ The church being gathered, and furnished with able helps, officers and brethren, they proceed to the administration of all the public ordinances in public assemblies, especially on every Lord’s-day : wherein our principal care and desire is to administer and partake in all, and no more than all, the ordinances of Christ himself ; and in all those, so far as the Lord hath lent us light, in their native purity and simplicity, without any dressing or painting of human inventions.” . . First then ; when we come together in the church, according to the apostle’s direction we make ‘ prayers, and intercessions, and thanksgivings’ for ourselves and ‘ for all men ;’ⁿ not in any prescribed form of prayer or studied liturgy, but in such a manner as ‘ the Spirit’ of grace and prayer—who teacheth all the people of God [for] what and

^a Eph. v. 1.

^d Rom. xiv. 3.

^g Matt. xiii. 25, 38.

^k Acts. viii. 37.

ⁿ P. 65.

^b 1 Cor. i. 2 ; Col. i. 2.

^e Matt. xvi. 16—19

^h 2 Tim. iii. 5.

ⁱ P. 56—58.

^o 1 Tim. ii. 1.

^c Acts ii. 47.

^f Matt. xxii. 12.

ⁱ Matt. iii. 6.

^m P. 59—64.

how to pray^a—‘helpeth our infirmities,’ we having respect therein to the necessities of the people, the state of the times, and the work of Christ in our hands. After prayer, either the pastor or teacher readeth a chapter in the Bible and expoundeth it, giving ‘the sense,’ to cause ‘the people to understand the reading.’^b And in sundry churches, the other—whether pastor or teacher—who expoundeth not, he preacheth the Word; and in the afternoon, the other who preached in the morning doth usually, if there be time, read and preach, and he that expounded in the morning, preacheth after him. Before sermon, and many times after, we sing a psalm; and because the former translation of the Psalms doth in many things vary from the original, and many times paraphraseth rather than translateth, besides divers other defects which we cover in silence, we have endeavoured a new translation of the Psalms into English metre, as near the original as we could express it in our English tongue, so far as for the present the Lord hath been pleased to help us, and those Psalms we sing both in our public churches, and in private.”^c

“The seals of the covenant—to wit, the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s supper—are administered either by the pastor or by the teacher: and though with some godly-learned divines, it be a question, whether the teacher may dispense the seals, yet the question doth rather concern School-doctors than the teachers of a particular church; but we who have only the teachers of particular churches, do believe that they to whom the preaching or dispensing of the Gospel, or covenant of grace, unto the church is committed, to them is committed also the dispensing of the seals of the covenant: but to the teacher as well as the pastor, is committed the dispensing of the Gospel, the covenant of grace, unto the church; and therefore, to him, as well as to the other, is committed the dispensing of the seals of the covenant. Both the sacraments we dispense according to the first institution. Baptism, to disciples and, who are included in them, their seed; the Lord’s supper to such as neither want knowledge nor grace to examine and judge themselves before the Lord. Such as lie under any offence, publicly known, do first remove the offence before they present themselves to the Lord’s table, according to Matt. v. 23, 24. The members of any church, if any be present, who bring Letters-testimonial with them to our churches, we admit them to the Lord’s-table with us; and their children also—if occasionally in their travel, they be born with us—upon like recommendation, we admit to baptism. The prayers we use at the administration of the seals, are not any set forms prescribed to us, but conceived by the minister according to the present occasion and the nature of the duty in hand. Ceremonies we use none, but are careful to administer all things according to the primitive institutions. The father presenteth his own child to baptism as being baptized by the right of his covenant; and not of the covenant unto Godfathers and Godmothers—for there is no such covenant of God unto them and their Godsons—and therefore we have no use of them; but omit them, in baptism, as the apostle cast out love-feasts from the Lord’s-supper; being both of them alike superadditions to

^a Rom viii. 26, 27.^b Neh. viii. 8.^c P. 66, 67.

the Lord's institutions; 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24 [33, 34]. The Lord's-supper we administer for the time, once a month at least; and for the gesture, to the people sitting, according as Christ administered it to his disciples,^a who also made a symbolical use of it, to teach the church their majority over their ministers in some cases, and their judicial authority as co[as]sessors with him at the last judgment;^b which maketh us look at kneeling at the Lord's-supper not only as an adoration devised by man, but also as a violation by man of the institution of Christ; diminishing part of the counsel of God, and of the honour and comfort of the church held forth in it. In time of solemnization of the supper, the minister having taken, blessed, and broken the bread, and commanded all the people to take and eat it as the 'body' of Christ 'broken' for them,^c he taketh it himself, and giveth it to all that sit at table with him; and from the table it is reached by the deacons to the people sitting in the next seats about them; the minister sitting in his place at the table. After they have all partaken in [sic] the bread, he taketh the cup in like manner and giveth 'thanks' anew—blesseth it—according to the example of Christ in the Evangelist who describes the institution: all of them, in such a way as setteth forth the elements not 'blessed' together, but either of them apart;^d for what reason, the Lord himself best knoweth. And we cannot be ignorant that a received solemn blessing expressly performed by himself, doth apparently call upon the whole assembly to look again for a supernatural and special blessing in the same element also as well as in the former; for which the Lord will be again sought to do it for us. After the celebration of the supper, a psalm of thanksgiving is sung;^e and the church dismissed with a blessing."^f

"In the afternoon, after public prayer offered up to God either by the pastor or teacher, and the Word read and expounded by them who preached in the morning, if there be time, and preached by the other; and the sacrament of baptism administered, if any of the church do offer their children thereunto; the deacons—who sit in a seat under the elders, yet in sundry churches lifted up higher than the other pews—do call upon the people, That as God hath prospered them, and made their hearts willing, there is now time left for contribution. Presently, the people from the highest to the lowest in sundry churches, do arise; the first pew first, the next next, and so the rest in order, and present before the Lord their holy offerings. For in the Old Testament, at their solemn feasts, none was to 'appear before the Lord empty';^g and the Lord's-day, is only unto Christians the ordinary 'solemn feast' of the Lord: in the New Testament, the Christians laid down their oblations 'at the apostles' feet';^h into whose place for that service deacons were substituted.ⁱ And to that purpose the apostle gave 'order unto the churches' that 'upon the first day of the week, every one should lay by him into the treasury,' as the word signifieth, for 'the supply of the saints, as God hath prospered them [him].'^k . . After the

^a Matt. xxvi. 20.^b Luke xxii. 27—30.^c 1 Cor. xi. 24.^d Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 23; Luke xxii. 17 [20].^e Matt. xxvi. 30.^f P. 67—69.^g Deut. xvi. 16.^h Acts iv. 35.ⁱ Acts vi. 3.^k 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.

contribution ended, the time left is taken up in sundry churches in the public trial and admission of such as are to be received members into the church, in such manner as hath been before declared: and so, after a psalm of praise to God, with thanksgiving, and prayer to God for a blessing upon all the ordinances administered that day, and a blessing pronounced upon the people, the assembly is dismissed.”^a

“Besides the celebration of the Lord’s-day every week, we sometimes upon extraordinary occasions either of notable judgments do set apart a day of humiliation, or upon special mercies we set apart a day of thanksgiving: the grounds whereof we conceive are generally known and applied amongst Christians. Moreover, every week, in most of our churches Lectures are kept on some or other of the week-days; so that such whose hearts God maketh willing, and his hand doth not detain by bodily infirmity, or necessary employments, . . . may have opportunity to hear the Word almost every day of the week in one church or other not far distant from them.”^b

Eighteen pages of disquisition are next occupied on the topics, “Prescribed Times of Prayer unlawful.—Who, admitted to Baptism and the Lord’s-supper.—Whose Children have right to Baptism.” Passing over all which, the subject of “Church Censures, how Dispensed,” ensues.

“We proceed not to Censure but in case of known offence; and such offence, as cannot be healed without censure. . . . If the offence be private between brother and brother, the brother offended is to follow the rule of Christ,^c that is first to ‘go and tell him his fault,’ or as the word signifies ‘convince’ him of his fault, and to admonish him of it privately; so that the plaister may be broader than the sore. Private admonition is most suitable to a private fault, and expresseth both the wisdom and love of the brother; who in so doing, both healeth and covereth the offence at once. If the offender take the admonition in good part—as taking part with the admonition against his own sin—the brother hath won and ‘gained’ him both to God and himself; to God, by repentance; to himself, by this experiment of his brotherly love. But if the offender hear not his brother, but takes part with his sin against the admonition, he then taketh one or two more with him; such as in wisdom he thinketh to be most fit to prevail with him; that so by ‘the mouth of two or three’ his ‘word’ of admonition ‘may be established;’ or if the offender hear them not, his word of accusation ‘to the church’ may be established. And they coming to the offender . . . first call upon the Name of Christ, to be present with them in this duty; according to his promise, where he hath said he will be present with any ‘two or three’ that are met together in his ‘Name,’ to ask [counsel] of Him—for it is upon this occasion, and this chiefly, upon which the promise is made.^d— . . . If they can prevail with him to acknowledge his offence and to be humbled for it, the soul of the offender is healed; thanks are given to God, and mutual love [is] renewed and increased amongst themselves. But if the offender deny the [alleged] fact, and there is none to prove it but the brother that brought them [the brethren], they can proceed no further, because the testimony of

^a P. 69, 70.^b P. 70.^c Matt. xviii. 15—17.^d Verses 19, 20.

one against one will not stand in judgment.^a If he acknowledge the fact, but do not acknowledge the sinfulness of it, but stand stiffly to justify it, then the brother first offended telleth the church of it, to wit, in God's way: he telleth the elders, who are the mouth of the church, that by them it may be presented before the church and the cause heard and examined and judged by them. Then one of the elders either by himself or calling forth the brother offended, declareth the offence, . . . and what course he took . . . to heal his brother: . . . then, how he took a brother or two more, . . . but neither so could he or they prevail with him; which they being present do openly testify, before the Lord and his church: and so by 'the mouth of two or three,' the word of his accusation is 'established' before the church. The church being thus informed . . . the elders do labour in public with the offender: . . . it is free also for any of the brethren—leave and liberty being first desired and obtained of the elders—to help forward the conviction by any words 'of wisdom'^b and zeal which God shall put into their mouths; wherein if the convictions and persuasions . . . prevail, . . . the offender is gained, the sin is subdued, others [are] discouraged from the like offence, and the church is satisfied. But if . . . the offender stand out in defence of his sin, . . . the church then entereth into consideration, . . . Whether it be gross and heinous; such as . . . 1 Cor. v. 11 . . . or, Whether it be such as through some mist of ignorance or strength of passion, he doth not clearly discern the sinfulness of it. If it be of the former sort, they proceed then to excommunication: . . . if it be of the latter sort, the church proceedeth not forthwith to excommunication . . . but after once or twice admonition: for in this case it is . . . as with a 'heretic.'^c . . . When therefore, an 'admonition' is judged seasonable, one of the elders with the consent of the whole church, doth re-collect the offence and all the arguments of weight, . . . and . . . that invalidity and shallowness of all his answers and evasions; and thereupon, doth solemnly in the Name of the Lord, admonish and charge him to see the danger of such a sin, and [the] distemper of his soul in [the] maintaining of it. . . Whilst the brother is thus cast, and lieth under the censure of 'admonition' . . . he doth abstain from the Lord's-table, according to the direction of our Saviour;^d or as the priests in the Law did;^e or, as Haggai, ii. 12, 13. . . If . . . by the grace of Christ, he come to himself and . . . desire to reconcile himself to the Lord and his brethren, he then . . . is called forth, in the face of the church, to make public confession of his sin and to judge himself for it: . . . they bless God for his blessing upon his ordinance, and readily receive him into wonted favour. . . But if, on the contrary, the spirit of the brother . . . stand out against all means . . . of his reformation; the church having waited a convenient time, . . . they giving their consent, as before for his admission so now for his expulsion, . . . he [one of the elders] pronounceth him cut off from the communion of the church, and delivereth him unto Satan, etc.^fg

"Whilst the offender lieth under the censure of excommunication, . . . yet we do not debar him from entrance into the assembly . . . in time

^a Deut. xix. 15.^b 1 Cor. xii. 8.^c Tit. iii. 10.^d Matt. v. 23, 24.^e Levit. xxii. 3, 4.^f Matt. xviii. 17; 1 Cor. v. 415.^g P. 89—92.

of preaching the Word, or prayer, or such other worship of God as is not peculiar to the church; for this liberty we do not forbid to heathen and Indians: and persons excommunicate are but as [the] heathen in respect of worship; although worse than [the] heathen, even as publicans, in respect of familiar private communion; for though we might 'eat' with a heathen,^a yet with a publican the Jews would not 'eat,'^b no more may we with excommunicate persons.^c But we do not read that any heathen was forbidden to hear the Word in the synagogues, though they were not permitted to enter into the temple, which was to them of a sacramental nature;^d nor might they enter as members, 'into the congregation.'^e But suppose [the] heathen were forbidden to hear the Word even in the synagogues, yet seeing that wall of partition between Jews and heathen is now broken down as in other respects so in this, it is not now unlawful for an infidel or heathen to come into the assembly of the church.^f . . . Moreover, this further compassion and succour we afford an excommunicate, . . . we have not cast him out also of our hearts nor of our prayers, nor out of our care to recover such a lost sheep into Christ's fold again; and therefore, still though we forbear all familiar fellowship with him and countenance towards him, . . . yet we 'account him not as an enemy,' but still take opportunity to 'admonish him as a brother.'^g And if we find, by the blessing of God and Christ upon the censure, or by the rebukes of 'many' ministered unto him, that the soul of the excommunicate person be humbled,^h the elders . . . call him forth before the church, where he giving glory to God, and confessing his sin and the justice of God against him, and holding forth a repenting frame of spirit to the satisfaction of the church, they do with *common consent* forgive him and comfort him, and confirm their love to him by receiving him again into communion . . . as before."ⁱ

"When we say we do this or that with 'common consent,' our meaning is, we do not carry on matters either by the over-ruling power of the Presbytery or by the consent of the major part of the church; but by the general and joint consent of all the members of the church, . . . *ὁμοθυμαδόν*, 'with one accord,'^k as becometh the church of God.^l . . . If it do appear that dissent, whether of one or more brethren, do arise from such darkness and intricacy of the matter in hand as that the officers and members of the church do find themselves either unable to clear the matter fully, or at least unfit in regard of some prejudice which may be conceived against them, . . . in such a case, when the matter is weighty and the doubt great on both sides, then with common consent we call in for light from other churches, and entreat them to send over to us such of their elders or brethren as may be fit to judge in such a cause."^m

"The reasons that prevail with us to take this course seem, to us, to have evident ground from Scripture; and therefore may excuse us from following the pattern of such churches as rather consult with human

^a 1 Cor. x. 27.

^d Acts xxi. 28, 29.

^g 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.

^k Acts ii. 46.

^m P. 94—96.

^b Matt. ix. 11.

^e Deut. xxxiii. 3—8.

^h 2 Cor. ii. 6.

^l Acts iv. 32; 1 Cor. i. 10; Phil. ii. 2, 3.

^c 1 Cor. v. 11.

^f 1 Cor. xiv. 23—25.

ⁱ P. 93, 94.

wisdom than Divine institution in this case: [that we allow to the people so much power]. Our first reason is taken from the royal rule of love and wisdom.. Matt. xviii. 17... Now we cannot find throughout the New Testament that ever the word 'church' is taken otherwise than for the society and congregation of the faithful; unless it be once, where it is taken for a civil assembly.^a But never, for one bishop, or counsellor, or archdeacon; for neither doth the Scripture acknowledge any of those offices in the church at all, .. taking a 'bishop' as now they stand, nor can the 'church' which is a word of multitude hold forth a bishop or his commissary, who is but one person. . . The bishop cometh in his own name, and the commissary in the bishop's name; but neither of them in the church's name; nor with instructions from the church, but rather with destructions, or at least with disturbances to the church. Neither is the word 'church' taken throughout the New Testament for an assembly of presbyters: the Consistory, is a word unheard of there! Nor are any complaints directed thither, unless it be to prepare them for the hearing and judgment of the church; as 'all the elders' are said to be assembled in the house of James, to prepare and instruct Paul for the carriage of his matter before the church.^b Nor are any censures of the church committed to presbyters alone, to be administered by them; though they be to be administered by them in the presence and with the consent of the church: and therefore, when 'the angels' of the churches in Asia are blamed for neglect of proceeding against offenders—whether Balaam, or Jezebel, or the Nicolaitanes,—the charge is given not to the angels of the churches only, but 'to the churches' also themselves.^c And though the word 'congregation' which is all one with church, be sometimes put in the Old Testament for 'elders' or 'judges' of the congregation, yet it is far more frequently put for the elders and body of the people met together. . . When it is put for the elders and judges, .. as Num. xxxv. 12, 24, 25, it is never understood of them sitting in a consistory by themselves apart from the people, but in the presence of the public assembly of the people; who also had liberty, in such cases,^d to rescue an innocent [person] from unjust punishment. . . When a whole multitude is associated in a body, any offence may be orderly and ordinarily told unto them by a complainant; especially in case any officer amongst them shall call him forth to tell his complaint: as 'the Levite' orderly told his complaint to the whole multitude of the congregation of Israel assembled at Mizpeh.^e . . The promise made to 'two or three,' Matt. xviii. 20, respecteth not the judges of the cause when it is brought to the church, but to the 'two or three' brethren who dealt in the cause before it came to the church: as, in like sort, the promise of binding in heaven what the church bindeth on earth, verses 18, 19, pertaineth to the ratifying of the censure of the whole 'church' mentioned in the verse before. A second reason why we allow such power .. is taken from the practice of the church of Corinth .. 1 Cor. v. 4, 5; .. where Paul saying, in the verse foregoing, that he had 'judged already,' .. doth not argue that .. he took the

^a Acts xix. 41.^b Acts xxi. 18.^c Rev. ii. 17, 29.^d 1 Sam. xiv. 45.^e Jud. xx. 3—7.

power of judging the cause;.. and [that] the publication and declaration of it only [were] in the church; but that he had seen already evident cause to judge the party worthy to be cast out; but directed them to do it. . . There is no word in the text that attributeth any power to the presbytery apart, or singularly above the rest. But as the reproof is directed to them all for not mourning, etc. verses 1, 2; so is the commandment directed to them all when they 'are gathered together,' ver. 4. In like sort, in the end of the chapter, he exhorteth them all again; 'put away from among yourselves that wicked person;' and that by a judicial power—to wit, as under Christ—'do not ye judge them that are within;' ver. 12, 13. And lest this judgment should be restrained to the presbyters only, he magnifieth the judgments of 'the saints;' taking occasion, from hence, to stretch their judicature, in some cases even to civil matters also: 'know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?' yea, the 'angels?' chap. vi. 2, 3. And thereupon he encourageth them to betrust the deciding of any civil cause depending 'between brethren,' to the judicature of the meanest brother in the church, ver. 4, rather than to fly suddenly unto civil magistrates, especially amongst the heathen!"^a

" 'But' [asks our objector] 'if the power of judicature be committed to the whole church together with the presbytery, then all the multitude shall be made governors, and who then shall be governed?' The multitude of brethren are governed by the elders so long as they rule aright, to wit, while they hold forth the Word and 'voice' of Christ, which 'the sheep' of Christ are wont to 'hear.'^b But in case the officers do err and commit offence, they shall be governed by the whole body of the brethren; though otherwise the brethren are bound to 'obey' and submit to them, in the Lord.^c 'A democratical government might do well in Athens, a city of pregnant wits, but will soon degenerate to an anarchy amongst rude common people!' It is unworthy the spirit of so godly-learned a man as maketh this objection, to prefer, 'Athens' before Jerusalem; 'pregnant wits,' before sanctified hearts! . . . The elders having received, in special manner, the power of 'the keys,' they have the power to open and shut the doors of speech and silence; in which respect the government of the church is not merely democratical, but, as the 'best' governments be, of a mixed temper: in respect of Christ whose 'voice' only must be heard and his rule kept, it is a monarchy; in respect of the people's power in choosing officers, and joint power with the officers in admitting members [and] in censuring offenders, it is a democracy; in respect of the officers' instruction and reproof of the people in the public ministry, and in ordering of all things in the assembly, it is an aristocracy! What is found good in any civil government, is in church-government; and what is found evil is, by the wisdom of Christ, safely avoided and prevented. . . In case of offence given by any elder, or by the whole eldership together, the church hath authority to require satisfaction of them,^d and [or] . . . to proceed to censure, according to the quality of the offence.^e . . . In case of the apostacy of the church,

^a P. 96—99.^b John x. 3, 4.^c Heb. xiii. 17.^d Acts xi. 2—18.^e "Plebs . . . potestatem etiam habet sacerdotes indignos recusandi et abdicandi." Cyprian. Lib. i. Ep. iv.

or of other notorious scandal committed by them, and their obstinacy therein; the elders have power to denounce the judgment of God against the church, and to withdraw themselves from it: as upon the idolatry of the Israelites, *Exod. xxx. 7*; and Paul with Barnabas, rejected the Jews, *Acts xiii. 45, 46.*"^a

"The communion of saints, is accounted an article of the Creed, and communion of churches, is but a branch thereof. Seven ways there be wherein we exercise holy communion one with another: . . first, by participation; secondly, of recommendation; thirdly, of consultation; fourthly, of congregation; fifthly, of contribution; sixthly, of admonition; seventhly, of propagation, or multiplication of churches. . . [That] by way of congregation, or gathering together many churches, or the messengers of many churches[,is] to examine and discuss either some corrupt opinions or suspicious practices which, being scattered and found in many churches at once, cannot well be healed in any one alone. In which case, the elders of the churches desirous to maintain verity, and unity of judgment in matters of doctrine, and integrity of life, throughout all the churches, do both acquaint our magistrates being 'nursing fathers' to the church, with the necessary occasions and ends of a general and a solemn assembly, and do also solicit the churches to send some fit persons at such a time to such a church where the assembly [may] be most seasonably held, to consider and discern of the matter in question and agitation. . . It is free for any man present, and all may be present if they will, as well the messengers of the churches as others, after leave orderly craved or obtained, to propound their doubts without offence; whence disputation doth arise—as in *Acts xv. 7*—till all parties be either satisfied or convinced, and so the matters in controversy are cleared. . . So far as they are all come, they judge and mind one thing: if any be otherwise minded who in simplicity of heart seeketh the truth, and in meekness of wisdom and love holdeth forth the same, we hope God will in time reveal the same unto him. In the mean time, all agreeing in this one [thing], not to 'condemn' nor to 'despise' one another in differences of weakness; according to the apostle's rule, *Rom. xiv. 2—4.*"^b

"Thus have we given unto all our holy Brethren throughout the churches of our Lord Jesus, a just and true account of all our proceedings in church-affairs, so far as concerneth our way and order amongst ourselves. . . If the way we walk in be found, upon serious and mature consideration, to be agreeable to the rules of the Gospel, as we verily believe it is; let all the upright in heart be entreated, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, not to judge or speak evil of the ways of Christ, before his people; but rather seek how to address themselves and to call on others, to walk in the straight steps of the Lord Jesus in the kingdom of his grace, till we shall all come to meet Him in the kingdom of his glory!"^c

"We take not upon us, as *ἁλλοτριόεπισκοποι*, to prescribe unto our Brethren in England—men of their churches, and eminent lights in the world,—what course to take in pursuing and perfecting the great work of Reformation in England. . . Only being absent in body but

^a P. 99—102.^b P. 103, 106, 107.^c P. 110.

present in spirit, we crave leave to bear witness to them and with them, that if the Lord be pleased to prosper his work amongst them, it is possible to reduce the estate of the Congregations in England to such a reformation as is suitable to the pattern revealed in the Gospel, according to the way of primitive simplicity described above. Four things we observe in the estate of the churches in England which make way for reformation amongst them. First; the efficient instruments of their first plantation; which were either apostles or apostolical men, whether Philip, or Joseph of Arimathea, or Simon Zelotes; as any of our countrymen may read in Mr. Fox's book of Acts and Monuments, in the beginning of it, next after the story of the two persecutions, out of Gildas, Tertullian, Origen, Beda, Nicephorus. Which being so, we cannot but conceive the churches in England were rightly gathered, and planted according to the rule of the Gospel: and all the corruptions found in them since, have sprung from popish apostacy in succeeding ages, and from want of thorough and perfect purging out of that leaven in the late times of Reformation in the days of our fathers. So that all the work now, is not to make them churches, which were none before, but to reduce and restore them to their primitive institution. Secondly; the public service book acknowledgeth that 'In the primitive church, there was a godly discipline;' that 'notorious' sinners 'were put to open penance, and punished in this world' that both 'their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord and [that] others, admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend.' Which 'godly discipline' is a thing, saith the book, 'much to be desired [wished] that it might 'be restored again.'^a It is therefore acknowledged by the very state of the churches of England, that the present estate of church-discipline is not perfect, but defective, and swerving from 'the primitive' godly discipline! Thirdly; in the public Rubric before the Catechism [Order of Confirmation], it is ordered that when 'children' come to 'years of discretion,' and have learned what others 'promised for them in baptism,' they should then 'themselves, with their own mouth and with their own consent, openly before the church, ratify and confirm the same; and also promise that, by the grace of God, they will evermore endeavour themselves, faithfully to observe and keep such things as by their own mouth and confession they have assented to.' Which course, the book, in a few words after, acknowledgeth to be agreeable with the usage of the church of times past, That children coming to perfect age, having been instructed in the christian religion, should openly profess their own faith, and promise to be obedient to the will of God! Which direction, if it were as duly observed as it is expressly ordered, doth plainly hold forth that 'the Church of England,' as they call it, doth not acknowledge any to be confirmed members of the Church,—and so unfit to partake of the Lord's supper,—till they have expressly confessed their faith openly before the Church, and promised obedience to the will of God. Which if it be seriously done, and not prefectorily, is somewhat of like nature with our receiving of members into the church and joining them by covenant! Fourthly; in the 'Exhortation,' before the [celebration of the holy communion], the minister is directed to denounce unto the people, That 'if any of them

^a "A Commination, etc." *in init.*

be a blasphemer of God, a hinderer or slanderer of his Word, an adulterer, or be in malice or envy, or in any other grievous crime,' they should bewail their sins, and 'not come to that holy table, lest after the taking of that [holy] sacrament, the devil enter into them, as he entered into Judas, etc.' Which plainly argueth, they would allow no scandalous person to partake in the Communion of the Lord's table! All these things presupposed, really performed, and seriously attended to, might open a door to sundry passages of a more full and perfect Reformation"^a

Now therefore we are arrived at a plan of Reformation which purports to be Cotton's, but which should seem to be the result of profound deliberation among several, perhaps many, heads and hands; attesting their competency to devise what was most suitable to be practised under the existing order of affairs, and ultimately to terminate in that "primitive simplicity" which best accords with "the pattern revealed in the Gospel."^b With this design, fifteen propositions are tendered, and which shut up that "full declaration of the Church-Way in all particulars," announced on the title-page. The two platforms of Reformation of the State-Churches, that by the Presbyterians and this by the Congregationalists, will, both here and elsewhere, be fully placed before the reader; whose attention is therefore called to "Certain Propositions, tending to the Reformation of the Churches in England."

"PROP. i. Where godly ministers be already planted in any Congregations, let them—with due encouragement from the State—call the people to solemn humiliation before the Lord for their own sins, and those of their fathers they have imitated. So did Ezra and Nehemiah, with the Levites and priests; and upon the like occasions.^c For though the Parliament and the whole kingdom have *protested* and *covenanted* reformation for the time to come, yet they have cause also to be humbled, and that thoroughly, for the past.

"PROP. ii. Let such of the people as are of good knowledge in the ways of God, and of approved conversation, take up that course which the Service-Book—as hath been said—giveth a hint of:—renew their covenant formerly made in baptism; professing their faith and repentance; and promising reformation of life, not only in their private conversation but also in their public communion in the church of God; yielding professed subjection to the Gospel of Christ in the fellowship of His holy ordinances.

"PROP. iii. Let no minister that loves the Lord Jesus better than his own belly, stand upon his advocation [advowson] from his patron but rather expect his vocation from his people.

"PROP. iv. For this end, let every patron restore his 'jus patronatus' to the church. Or if it seem too hard a thing for them to part so freely with their freehold—though they ought freely to give unto Christ, who have received freely from Him,—the Parliament may be pleased to give them a competent part of the revenues of the 'benefice,' as they call it, and annex it to their own private inheritance; reserving so much to the use of the Church, as may strengthen their hands in a

^a P. 111—113. ^b See back, p. 576. ^c Neh. ix. 1—4; Ezra x. 1, 2, 9, 10.

sufficient maintenance of their ministry : for though ‘things dedicated to sacred use cannot be alienated, or diverted to private use, without sacrilege,’ yet that holdeth in such things as are so dedicated to sacred use as that ‘the Lord accepteth [them] as sacred to Himself. But God nowhere in the New Testament hath expressed His acceptance or allowance of lands dedicated to the ministry [alone], but only to the service of the whole church ; and, then, for the Church’s service they may be disposed of, by their consent : as sometimes the kings and princes of Israel gave away the treasures of the Temple to save themselves from captivity.^a

“ Prop. v. The people having called or chosen their minister—one or more—unto office in a day of humiliation, let them, in the presence of the ministers of other churches, depute some of the gravest and godly members of the church to lay their hands upon him, with prayer over him in the Name of the Lord setting him apart to that office. The ‘whole congregation’ are said to *anoint* Zadok to the office of a high priest, as well as Solomon to be king,^b which is a sacred rite as [is] imposition of hands ; and this, the whole body of them could not do but by deputing some eminent persons amongst them to the performance thereof. But after they be furnished with elders—a presbytery of their own,—let imposition of hands be given by them, according to 1 Tim. iv. 14, to such as for the future shall be ordained.

“ Prop. vi. For the making up of a presbytery, instead of a ‘parson’ and ‘vicar’—wherewith some congregations are endowed,—let them choose ‘pastors and teachers ;’ and ruling-elders, instead of those who crept into their room namely, the churchwardens and sidesmen. But let them choose and ordain them in a day of humiliation, according to Acts xiv. 23, and not for a year only, but during life : and let the presbyteries of all neighbour-churches take all opportunities to make use one of another for brotherly consultation, but not for jurisdiction and authority one over another. And instead of collectors or overseers for the poor, who crept into the room of deacons, let deacons be chosen as hath been showed above,^c but not as members of the presbytery!

“ Prop. vii. For set forms of prayer, or prescript liturgies, let them not be enjoined unto the ministers of the churches ; but let the ministers as well give up themselves wholly unto prayer as to the ministry of the Word.^d

“ Prop. viii. Baptism may be orderly administered to the children of such parents as have professed their faith and repentance before the church, as above ;^e or, where either of the parents have made such profession. Or it may be considered also, whether the children may not be baptized where either the grandfather or grandmother have made such profession, and are still living to undertake for the Christian education of the child : for it may be conceived where there is a stipulation of the ‘covenant’ on God’s part and a restipulation on man’s part, there may be an obligation of the ‘covenant’ on both parts.^f Or if these fail, what hindereth but that, if the parents will resign their infant to be educated in the house of any godly member of the church, the child

^a 2 Kings xviii. 15, 16.

^b 1 Chron. xxix. 20—22.

^c See back, p. 563.

^d Acts vi 4.

^e See back, p. 567.

^f Gen. xvii. 7.

may be lawfully baptized in the right of its household governor, according to the proportion of the Law, Gen. xvii. 12, 13 ?

“ Prop. ix. Let the Lord’s-supper be administered only to such as have so professed their faith and repentance publicly, and are received and approved members of the church; endued with sufficient knowledge to ‘examine’ themselves and to ‘discern the Lord’s body:’^a free from scandal, and of good conversation.

“ Prop. x. Let officers in the church be redressed and removed, not by presentments to officers of other churches, but according to the order of the Gospel described above.^b

“ Prop. xi. Where the ministers of the congregation are ignorant or scandalous, meet it is that they were removed and better chosen in their room by the people; according to the counsel and direction of the godly ministers and brethren of neighbour-churches: Hos. iv. 6.

“ Prop. xii. Where the people in a congregation are generally ignorant and profane, it were necessary godly preachers were sent forth with countenance from the King and State, to preach unto them till they were brought on to knowledge, and to some measure of gracious reformation. Thus Jehoshaphat sent forth priests and Levites ‘to teach in the cities of Judah,’ and certain princes and nobles with them, to countenance the good work in their hands.^c

“ Prop. xiii. Till the people be in some sort duly prepared, and grown up to some measure of knowledge and grace, it were neither meet to receive them to a renewing of their covenant formerly made at their baptism, or [nor] to the seals of it. But after they have been wrought upon by the ministry of the Word to ‘lament after the Lord,’ as the Israelites did when ‘the ark’ had been long absent from them;^d then, let them proceed as other godly Christians were directed to do, Prop. ii, iii, etc. for renewing of their covenant, for choice of their ministers and officers, and for communication in all the liberties of the church of God.

“ Prop. xiv. For the help of the Universities; of the whole kingdom, and of all the churches in it; it were necessary that some experienced, godly learned, nobles and ministers, were deputed to visit and reform the Universities: that subscriptions to ceremonies and prescript liturgies were removed: that degrees in divinity were not abused unto qualifications for pluralities and non-residency; nor allowed in the ministers of churches, to put a difference between brethren of the same calling, whence Christ hath removed it—Matt. xxiii. 8—10. The *καθηγηται* there mentioned, is not to be translated ‘masters,’ for it is a title common to all ministers; but ‘doctors.’ And the academical title of ‘doctor’ is fitter for masters of colleges and readers in the schools, than for church officers. Here also, special care would be taken for setting up such preachers in both the Universities as whose spirit and gift and ministry might be exemplary patterns to young students.

“ Prop. xv. For the effectual and orderly expedition and transaction of all these things, it were requisite that as king Jehoshaphat did, so the King and State should depute some choice persons to do the

^a 1 Cor. xi. 28, 29. ^b See back, p. 570. ^c 2 Chron. xvii. 7—9. ^d 1 Sam. vii. 2.

same, to wit, to go throughout all the kingdom to see the people returned, and all the churches restored to a true state and course of Reformation.^a

“All which things are humbly presented by us not as if we would undertake to give counsel to them that are wiser than ourselves, much less injunctions; but as subjects who desire to approve our faithful service to the Lord, and our King and country, hold them forth as true consecretaries from the rules of the Gospel which should rule us all.”^b

How much in “earnest” the preceding and similar productions were endeavoured to be counteracted, is instanced in the speedy appearance of “*Vindiciæ Clavium: Or, A Vindication of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven into the Hands of the Right Owners. Being some Animadversions upon a Tract of Mr. J. C. called ‘The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven;’ as also upon another Tract of his called ‘The Way of the Churches of New England:’ Manifesting, 1. The Weakness of his Proofs; 2. The Contradictions to himself and others; 3. The Middle-Way—so called—of Independents, to be the Extreme or By-Way of the Brownists. By an Earnest Wellwisher of the Truth. Lond. 1645.*”^a 4to. pp. 90. Bearing Ja. Cranford’s “Imprimatur, July 4th, 1645.”

The “Reader” is told in five pages, “that the Brethren do not agree among themselves,” and that Cotton differs occasionally from himself “and yet” his “prefacers,” N. H. and I. H., “seem to approve it:” from all which, this Vindicator affirms that “this disagreement amongst themselves is prejudicious to their Cause and Way, to those that are judicious!” Then follow fourteen pages of “Animadversions upon the Brethren’s Epistle to the Reader,” and here too disagreement is held forth as the main proof of weakness, till at length the Vindicator proclaims that “the Brethren epistolers now begin to applaud themselves as jumping in judgment with their author, though so far remote as New England;” but even this will not satisfy, for he adds, “but men agree in error sometimes, that never knew one another!” And strange as it may seem, “after all this agreement of the Brethren with this absent author—to a wonder, if not to a miracle, as they would have us think; though we believe they were not strangers to the plot of this author either before or since his going over;—they enter their dissent against some opinions and passages of this author in the platform by him described.” Whether or not, this Vindicator has intitled himself to be classed among “those that are judicious?” is a query of no difficult solution.

The reader may rest assured that the general argument sustains no real loss by not having before him here a fuller insight into the Vindicator’s dialectics. What can be expected from one who writes thus discourteously? “I pray, Sir, tell us next time you write over, how many churches have you multiplied amongst the Indians in New England? Not one, that I ever heard of. You have divided churches, indeed, from Old England; but propagated none. And our ‘Brethren’ at home, how many churches have they divided and distracted since their return, but have multiplied none! If some new Teachers should

^a 2 Chron. xix. 4.

^b P. 113—ult.

arise in New England and gather—or rather steal—some members out of every of your congregations, would you call this ‘multiplication of churches;’ or rather division?’^a But we shall content ourselves with a notice of this said Vindicator’s own “contradictions,” as treated of by Cotton himself in his “Way of Congregational Churches *Cleared*,” which piece will be made use of further in a subsequent chapter. “The author of the book intituled, ‘Vindiciæ Clavium,’ thought good to conceal his own name, though in matters of accusation, whereof the book is full. It was ‘the manner of the Romans’—and that Roman manner was but just and equal—to have the accuser show himself ‘face to face.’”^b And indeed the equity and equality of brotherly love would have required him either to have declared his own name or to have concealed mine as well as his own. . . . But since the author of ‘Vindiciæ’ is pleased to conceal his name, I therefore think it not amiss, for brevity’s sake and to prevent a long periphrasis . . . only to take leave to call him Vindex, or, in English, sometimes the Assertor, sometimes the Avenger; which both the title and purport of his book do hold him forth to be, as acting the part of both.

“The scope of his book, so far as concerneth me, is chiefly to show forth my ‘weaknesses’ and ‘contradictions,’ as his title manifesteth. But if Christ may have any glory by that, I shall willingly acknowledge—without his accusation, and much more without his conviction—that I am made up of ‘weaknesses and contradictions!’ . . . Nevertheless all this, will not argue that which the Avenger saith he hath heard, that I have ‘often altered’ my ‘judgment’ since I went to New England; nor, that ‘the author of the Keys does directly contradict the author of the Way, which is himself!’ I have not had liberty to peruse ‘The Way’ [1645,] since it was published; but I see by the first words of it that the publishers had not the copy which was taken hence from me, but an imperfect transcript: but I do believe what the publishers do report, that setting aside ‘some difference in logical terms,’ there is no material difference between the ‘Keys’ and the ‘Way’ either in ‘doctrine of divinity or in church-practice.’ Yes, saith the Avenger, ‘I find he doth’ in these ‘as flatly contradict himself as ever any man did. [I will] instance [but] in one place; . . . in the Keys, p. 4, he saith, ‘The Keys were delivered to Peter as an apostle, as an elder, and as a believer! The sense of the words—of Christ to Peter—will be most full if all the several considerations be taken jointly together. But in the Way, p. 27, he saith, The power of the Keys is given to the church; to Peter, not as an apostle, not as an elder, but as a perfect believer! Is not this a flat contradiction?’”^c

“Answer the first. The words are not mine but the Assertor’s, which he reporteth me to say in The Keys, ‘the keys were delivered to Peter as an apostle,’ etc. I would be loth to be found to speak so illogically as to say, ‘Socrates hath a power of motion given to him as a living creature, as a man, as a philosopher.’ It is a trivial rudiment in schools, Whatsoever is attributed to any as such, is given to all such universally, and to such reciprocally and only. If the keys were delivered to Peter as an apostle, then to all the apostles, and only to the

^a P. 44.^b Acts xxv. 16.^c To the Read: p. [iii, iv.]

apostles. My words, expressed by me, are plain enough and, I thank God, not destitute of reason : ‘ It hath proved a busy question, How Peter is to be considered in receiving this power of the keys, whether as an apostle, or as an elder—for an elder also he was,—or as a believer professing his faith before the Lord Jesus and his fellow-brethren.’ I added indeed, ‘ the sense of the words of Christ to Peter, To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven ;^a will be most full if all the several considerations be taken jointly together.’ Wherein as I expound my own meaning in the words following in that treatise of The Keys, so the publishers of The Keys do fitly express the same in their Epistle : ‘ The disposal,’ say they, ‘ of this power may lie in a due allotment into divers hands according to their several concernments, rather than in an entire and sole trust committed to any one man, or any sort or rank of men, or officers.’ What saith the Avenger to this ? ‘ Herein,’ saith he, ‘ perhaps we might agree with them ;’ but then, ‘ not with the author, who places all the power in one sort of men alone ; that is, the brethren, without officers :’^b but the Assertor taketh too much liberty to affirm, I say that in that place which in the same passage I do expressly deny : my words are express, ‘ They,’ that is the brethren, may not ‘ administer sacraments in defect of all officers, because by the appointment of Christ that pertaineth only to such as are called by office to preach the Gospel, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.’^c But, saith the Avenger, ‘ in The Way, p. 27, he saith, The power of the keys is given to the church ; to Peter, not as an apostle, etc. Is not this, a flat contradiction ?’ No verily, the solution is very easy and obvious, even to the Avenger himself if he would but have cast his eye upon the very next words in The Keys, whence this ἐναντιόφανεσ is fetched : the words run thus, ‘ The sense of the words will be most full if all the several considerations be taken jointly together. Take Peter, considered not only as an apostle but withal an elder also and a believer too, professing his faith ; all may well stand together. For there is a different power given to all these, to an apostle, to an elder, to a believer ; and Peter was all these, and received all the power which was given by Christ to any of these, or to all of these together. . . . So that Augustine did not mistake when he said, Peter received the keys in the name of the church.’ I cannot conceive what should move the Avenger so confidently to charge ‘ a flat contradiction’ in these two passages, . . . unless it were partly through misreport of my words in the one place, whereof before ; partly through misapprehension what the force in logic is of a quatenus tale, for he that knoweth that, he is not ignorant that if Peter had received the power of the keys quatenus apostolus, or quatenus presbyter, as an apostle or as an elder ; then, only apostles or only elders had received all church-power ; which all judicious divines and, I doubt not, himself amongst them, will utterly deny. But he that saith Peter received the power of the keys as standing in the room of all sorts of officers and members of the church, and so in the name of the whole church, he affirmeth that Peter received all church-power, which is found in all profest believers whether

^a Acts xvi. 19. ^b The Way, p. 45. Vind. Clav. : Animadversions, etc. p. [ii.]

^c The Way, p. 44.

officers or private brethren; and of officers, whether ordinary as elders, or extraordinary as apostles and evangelists. And is there any passage in *The Keys* which crosseth or 'contradicteth' this? . .

"Answer the second. . . If there seem to be any difference in the expression of the one treatise or of the other about this point, it is in the first subject of the power of the keys—which is a logical notion; but the point is the same both in doctrine of divinity and in church-practice. As for the imputation of inconstancy, which the *Avenger* is pleased to put upon me—'he hath heard that I have often altered my judgment since I went to New England'—I should thank him if he would tell me either wherein I have altered my judgment or from whom he so heard. . . John Baptist was surmised by some, to be 'a reed shaken with the wind,'^a but it was a windy fancy!

"And for a third answer: It were no just matter of calumny if, in some latter tractate, I should retract, or express more commodiously what I wrote in a former, less safely."^b

In a similar manner Cotton prosecutes this part of his object, and shows the inadvertency, if not wilfulness, of this opponent in particular. It is due from any who study the controversy, not to overlook or neglect the expositions which a writer of Cotton's deserved reputation found expedient to enter into for his own justification and the manifestation of truth.

^a Matt. xi. 7.

^b Part 2, p. 1—4.

END OF VOL. II.

PUBLISHED AND SOLD BY
FISHER, SON, AND CO.,

38, NEWGATE STREET, LONDON;

HUNTER STREET, LIVERPOOL; AND RUE ST. HONORÉ, PARIS.

NEW WORKS.

DEDICATED TO THE PRINCE ALBERT.

BUCKINGHAM'S (J. S.) AMERICA; HISTORICAL, STATISTIC, AND DESCRIPTIVE. With a Portrait of the Author, and Seventy Wood Engravings. Three Volumes Octavo, price £2. 2s.

"YOUR ROYAL HIGHNESS further condescended to observe, that, 'the feelings of good will towards the American people, under which the work was undertaken, could not fail at the present moment of producing a desirable effect.'"—*Extract from the Dedication.*

Uniform with "The Women of England."

SUMMER AND WINTER IN THE PYRENEES. By the Author of "The Women of England;" "Family Secrets;" &c. &c. Cloth, 9s.; silk, 11s.; morocco, 15s.

In Monthly Numbers, at One Shilling,

FAMILY SECRETS; or, Hints to those who would make Home Happy. By the Author of "The Women of England," now in its Fourteenth Edition. Every Number will be embellished with a highly-finished Engraving on Steel. Nos. I. to IV. are now ready.

"To wish prosperity to such a book as this is to desire the moral and physical welfare of the human species. May the Authoress go on and prosper."

REV. THOMAS SCOTT'S FAMILY BIBLE. FISHER'S ILLUSTRATED EDITION, to be completed in about 8 Divisions, bound in cloth, price 11s; or in 40 Monthly Parts, at 2s., EVERY PART embellished with a highly-finished Engraving on Steel, forming a series of views of the principal places mentioned in Scripture, from Drawings on the spot.

DIVISION the FIRST, just ready, containing Six Plates:

JERUSALEM.	DAMASCUS.	CEDARS OF LEBANON.
ZIDON.	LAKE OF TIBERIAS.	EPHESUS.

Fisher's edition of this invaluable Commentary is reprinted from the last which the author published in the vigour of life;—a genuine and authentic work, consisting wholly and entirely of the labours of the Rev. Thomas Scott *alone*; and which the Publishers feel confident will become not merely the *popular*, but the *standard* edition of Scott's Commentary.

In Volumes, or in Monthly Parts.

FISHER'S HISTORIC ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BIBLE, after the Old Masters. Volume I., containing Thirty Plates, engraved in the best manner, neatly bound in Cloth, gilt tops, price One Guinea; half morocco, elegant, £1. 5s.; morocco, elegant, £1. 10s.; proofs on large paper, cloth, £2. 2s. *To be continued.*

"The work is exceedingly well got up; the plates are clear, brilliant, and true; and the accompanying letter-press explanatory both of the picture and the portion of the Scriptures it illustrates. The work is, in fact, a commentary on the holy writings comprehensible by all capacities, calculated to assist the biblical student, and to allure youthful readers to prosecute the most important of all studies with ardour and enthusiasm. The work is also an elegant addition to the library."—*The Times.*

"This is the first volume of a most elegant work, and contains thirty exquisitely-engraved prints. Such a work *must command* an extensive sale."—*Literary Gazette.*

"The work is altogether handsome, and of solid merit; it forms a desirable FAMILY BOOK of elegant art."—*Tait's Edinburgh Magazine.*

THE RHINE, ITALY, AND GREECE, Illustrated. (*See p. 3.*)

THE TURKISH EMPIRE ILLUSTRATED; comprising CONSTANTINOPLE and the SEVEN CHURCHES of ASIA MINOR, &c. &c. Containing Ninety-six highly-finished Engravings, from beautifully coloured drawings made expressly for the work during a residence of several months, by Thomas Allom, Esq., Major Irton of the Rifle Brigade, and A. Hervé, Esq. With an Historical Account of Constantinople; a list of its Emperors and Sultans, from the dedication of the City to the present day, (to be found in no other work,) and descriptions of the plates by the Rev. ROBERT WALSH, LL.D., Chaplain to the British Embassy at the Ottoman Porte. In Two Vols. elegantly bound in Morocco, price £3. 3s.

"Fisher's Illustrations of Constantinople, &c., is one of the most beautiful and interesting of their many publications. Mr. Allom has caught the picturesque features of 'The City of the Sultan' with great success: his drawings are clear and brilliant, animated, but not too crowded, by picturesque and appropriate figures. The descriptive letter-press, too, is superior. The book, indeed, has a distinctive character, and will pass to the library as a curious and interesting record."—*Athenæum*.

The same Work, with the Descriptions in French. Three Vols. cloth elegant, £3. 3s.

SYRIA AND THE HOLY LAND. By JOHN CARNE, Esq. Illustrated in a series of One Hundred and Twenty large and highly-finished Engravings, from drawings taken during a journey made expressly for the purpose, by W. H. Bartlett, Esq. In Three quarto Vols. handsomely bound, embossed and gilt, price £3. 10s.

"It is difficult to imagine a series of views more full of interest for Christian readers than these Lebanon! Damascus! Antioch! Tarsus! what names are these! this is indeed a very beautiful publication."—*The British Magazine*.

"The work deserves to find its way into every house where there is the slightest pretension to taste in art, or respect for that sanctified territory, with every portion of which our minds have been familiarised in the Holy Scriptures."—*Edinburgh Evening Post*.

The same Work, with the descriptions in French. Three Vols. cloth elegant, £3. 10s.

THE SHORES AND ISLANDS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN. By the Rev. G. N. WRIGHT, M.A. Illustrated in a series of views from drawings on the spot by Major-General Sir Grenville T. Temple, Bart., W. L. Leitch, Esq., Lieut. Allen, of the Royal Engineers, and Major Irton, of the Rifle Brigade. In Two Vols. quarto, containing Sixty-five highly-finished Engravings, cloth elegant, price £2. 2s.

"The beauty of this work is surpassing: it is one of the cheapest and most desirable works we ever saw."—*John Bull*.

"Most beautiful are the scenes which the artists have selected, and we have obtained the testimony of eye-witnesses to their fidelity."—*Edinburgh Journal*.

"To those who like elegance and utility combined, we cordially recommend Fisher's Shores and Islands of the Mediterranean."—*Sheffield Iris*.

The same Work, with the descriptions in French. Two Vols. cloth elegant, £2. 2s.

THE HIMALAYA MOUNTAINS ILLUSTRATED. A Series of Thirty-eight exquisitely engraved Views, drawn by Turner, Stanfield, Roberts, Allom, &c., &c., from original sketches by GEORGE FRANCIS WHITE, Esq., 31st Regiment; with Descriptions by EMMA ROBERTS. One superb super-royal quarto Volume, elegantly bound in morocco, price £2. 2s.

"The book is cheaper at Two Guineas than half the rest [of the Annuals] would be at Two Pence."—*Quarterly Review*.

"As a production of art, the work needs fear no comparison or rivalry; it is a gem of the first order."—*Eclectic Review*.

"Their fidelity, their picturesque beauty, their magnificence, are so perfectly preserved, that the spectator seems, when he has closed the volume, to have traversed these 'wonders of Ind,' from the Ganges to the Jumna, and to have visited the sacred sources of these mighty streams."—*Literary Gazette*.

ITALY, FRANCE, AND SWITZERLAND ILLUSTRATED. By THOMAS ROSCOE, Esq. Three Vols. One Hundred and Thirty fine Engravings Elegantly bound in Cloth, price £3. 3s.

THE RHINE, ITALY, AND GREECE, Illustrated in a Series of Views from Drawings on the spot, by Messrs. Leitch, Bartlett, and Wolfensberger, Col. Cockburn, and Major Irton, with Descriptions by the Rev. G. N. Wright. In Monthly Parts, price 2s., each containing Four highly-finished Engravings. Parts I. to V. now ready.

The Publishers claim for this new and beautiful work, not only a place in the Drawing Room, as a work of Art, but in the Study also, as a useful aid in reading the history and geography of the countries represented.

"Another of Messrs. Fisher's beautiful sets of Views, corresponding with their Constantinople, The Mediterranean, &c."—*The Spectator*.

"A delicious portfolio of picturesque views. The scene is made to shift at every page, from the Rhine to the Tiber, from Athens to Mayence. There is the pleasure of rapid transition, variety, and contrast in this."—*The Patriot*.

"No three subjects could be better chosen for delineation than those here fixed upon; both from the beauty of their scenery and buildings, and the many associations connected with them. The engravings are executed in a most superior style. The work is very cheap, and we can cordially recommend it to the Public."—*Edinburgh Observer*.

"When will the interest felt in the scenes of Greece and Italy decay? One has been the teacher, the other was the conqueror of the world; and mankind owe too much to both, to suffer them to be forgotten. The Rhine, too, whose banks are the very 'shores of old romance,' has scenes and associations even more vivid than those more classic regions. Exhaustless in beauty, and rich in historical associations, few parts of the earth present such a field for the author and the artist."—*Devonport Independent*.

"The Rhine, Italy, and Greece!! How many delightful associations rush upon the mind in connection with each! Their very names operate as spells upon the heart. Who does not wish to be acquainted with the actual features of towns and scenes of which he has read and heard so much? The descriptions are excellent."—*Durham Chronicle*.

"The wonder is, how four such exquisite engravings can be given at the petty expense of sixpence each, not to speak of the letter-press, and the highly-creditable manner in which, as regards typography, &c., the whole is submitted for public patronage."—*Saunders' Dublin News' Letter*.

"This truly beautiful work is uniform with 'Constantinople' and 'The Mediterranean.' It cannot fail to add another laurel to the brows of the indefatigable publishers, to whom the admirable manner in which it is got up is not less honourable, than are the exquisite illustrations to the respective drawers and engravers."—*Liverpool Standard*.

"In every way this production is worthy to class amongst the foremost of its kind, and does honour even to the established reputation of its publishers."—*Dublin Warder*.

VIEWS IN INDIA, CHINA, and on the Shores of the RED SEA.

Drawn by Prout, Stanfield, Purser, Austin, Cattermole, Cox, Cotman, Copley Fielding, Boys, &c. &c., from Original Sketches by Captain Robert Elliott, R. N., and engraved by Finden, Goodall, Robert Wallis, Miller, Le Petit, Higham, Floyd, &c. &c., with Descriptions by EMMA ROBERTS. In Two Quarto Volumes, containing Sixty-four Engravings, handsomely bound, price £2. 2s.

"The grave of many a fellow-countryman, the ground on which many a friend has gathered glory, is in the rich East; and there are few who do not number among the dwellers in the far-off land, some kindred or acquaintance. India is, as it were, another home of Englishmen, of which they desire to know, and of which they ought to know, much. . . . We therefore, welcome with pleasure any publication calculated to forward this important object. The one to which we direct the attention of our readers, has another recommendation—it is excellent as a work of art."—*New Monthly*,

THE LAKE AND MOUNTAIN SCENERY OF WESTMORELAND, CUMBERLAND, DURHAM, and NORTHUMBERLAND, ILLUSTRATED. In a Series of Two Hundred and Sixteen Views, from drawings on the spot by Thomas Allom, Esq., with descriptive letter-press by THOMAS ROSE. In Three Vols. Quarto, tastefully bound and gilt, price £3. 3s.

"Those who have not had the pleasure of beholding that glorious pageantry of creation which is the boast of our island, will here find a faithful copy of it, to delight them, and at the same time to stimulate their curiosity to see the originals; while to those who have been familiar with the reality of the Lakes, these plates will prove a most grateful remembrancer."—*The Morning Herald*.

CHESTER, DERBY, LEICESTER, LINCOLN, NOTTINGHAM, and RUTLAND, ILLUSTRATED. From Original Drawings by Thomas Allom; with Descriptions by Messrs. NOBLE and ROSE. Containing Seventy-three Views, uniform with the Lake Scenery; handsomely bound, price 21s.

DEVONSHIRE AND CORNWALL ILLUSTRATED; from Original Drawings, by Thomas Allom; with Descriptions. Containing upwards of One Hundred and Forty Engravings, 4to., handsomely bound and gilt, price £2. 2s.

"One of the most splendid topographical volumes we have ever seen."—*Literary Gazette*.

"A very valuable addition to the many works which enrich our libraries, illustrative of the beauties, natural and artificial, of Great Britain."—*Morning Herald*.

LANCASHIRE ILLUSTRATED. From Original Drawings by Austin, &c.; with Descriptions. One Volume Quarto, containing One Hundred and Twelve Engravings, handsomely bound, gilt edges, £1. 11s. 6d.

SCOTLAND AND SCOTT ILLUSTRATED. Containing One Hundred and Eight Plates, from original landscapes and Historical Drawings by J. M. W. Turner, George Cruikshank, &c. &c.; with descriptions of the scenes represented (and extracts from the Waverley Novels) by G. N. Wright, M.A. Two Volumes Quarto, elegantly bound, price £2. 2s.

Either as a table volume, or as a companion to the reading of Scott's Novels, this work will be found equally interesting and instructive. References are given with each plate to the page of the Novel containing the subject illustrated.

IRELAND ILLUSTRATED. From Original Drawings by George Petrie, W. H. Bartlett, T. M. Baynes, &c.; with Descriptions. One Volume Quarto, containing Eighty-one Engravings, handsomely bound in Cloth, gilt edges, price £1. 1s.

THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY OF ILLUSTRIOUS and EMINENT PERSONAGES of the NINETEENTH CENTURY. A series of Portraits (with Memoirs) of Individuals who have most conspicuously contributed to the honour and happiness of the Country, by distinguishing themselves in the Senate, Church, Army, Navy, Law, Physic, Literature, Science, Art, Agriculture, Commerce, &c. &c. Engraved in the highest style, from the most authentic Paintings, &c. by eminent Masters. In Five handsome Volumes, imperial Octavo, each volume containing Thirty-six Portraits and Memoirs, half bound Morocco, gilt edges, price £1. 10s. each vol.

"As an attendant upon the national history, this work is inestimable. It gives to the perusal of our eventful annals an interest a hundred-fold greater than that which they possess without such an auxiliary."—*Morning Herald*.

CELEBRATED PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS. A series of Thirty-six authentic Portraits, engraved from the original Pictures by first-rate Artists. With Memoirs by T. J. Pettigrew, Esq., F.R.S. Two Volumes imperial Octavo, neatly bound, £2. 2s. Uniform with the National Portrait Gallery.

The PICTORIAL BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. With Life of Bunyan by JOSIAH CONDER, and Notes by W. MASON. Containing Twenty-five highly-finished Engravings from drawings by J. M. W. Turner, H. Melville, and George Baxter. A Portrait by William Derby, from the original picture; and a graphic representation of VANITY FAIR, by George Cruikshank. The text of this unique and unrivalled edition has been most carefully compared with the authorized edition, containing the Author's last additions and corrections. One Vol. cloth elegant, £1. 1s.; morocco elegant, £1. 10s.

"This exceedingly beautiful edition is fairly entitled to take precedence of all others. Its value is greatly enhanced by Mr. Conder's Memoir."—*Eclectic Review*.

"A splendid edition, with Life of Bunyan by Conder, which places his character in a new, and, as we apprehend, the true light. It is enriched with the best portrait of Bunyan that we have seen."—*Tait's Magazine*.

"The Printer and Engravers appear to have rivalled each other to confer honour upon a work which will never cease to be admired."—*Methodist Magazine*.

"We strive in vain to give utterance to our estimation of this most beautiful edition."—*Monthly Review*.

ABBOTT'S WAY for a CHILD to be SAVED, 18mo., price 1s. 6d.

ADAMS'S MODERN VOYAGER and TRAVELLER through Europe, Asia, Africa, and America; numerous coloured plates of Costumes, and Maps; 4 vols. in cloth, gilt edges, very neat, price 28s.

AMBROSE'S LOOKING UNTO JESUS, the Doctrine of Regeneration, Sanctification, and the Communion of Angels, one vol. 8vo. 10s.

ANALYSIS OF THE BIBLE, with Reference to the Social Duty of Man, by R. MONTGOMERY MARTIN. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; silk, 3s. 6d.

ANN, or the CONFLICT and TRIUMPH of FAITH, by THOMAS SPALDING. Cloth, 1s. 6d. Silk, 2s.

ATMORE'S WHOLE DUTY OF MAN, or the CHRISTIAN'S COMPANION, containing the most Important Truths of our Holy Religion, with the Duties he owes to God, to his Neighbour, and to himself; also Devout Meditations and Prayers, adapted to the various circumstances of Life, by the Rev. CHARLES ATMORE. In one volume, 4to. cloth, 17s., gilt edges, 18s.

BAINES'S HISTORY of the COTTON MANUFACTURE in Great Britain; with a Notice of its early History in the East, and in all the Quarters of the Globe. In one 8vo. volume, with many engravings; cloth, 15s.

"It is a literary and commercial treasure, whose value cannot be too highly estimated."—*Athenæum*.

BARTON'S (LUCY) GOSPEL HISTORY of CHRIST, addressed to Youthful Readers. Embellished with highly-finished steel engravings, illustrative of the principal Events in our Saviour's Life. Neatly bound, gilt edges, price 6s.

"One of the best books of the kind we remember to have seen."—*The Athenæum*.

BARCLAY'S UNIVERSAL, HISTORICAL, GEOGRAPHICAL, STATISTICAL, TOPOGRAPHICAL, TECHNICAL, PRONOUNCING ENGLISH DICTIONARY. An improved and enlarged edition; with 16 suitable plates, 4to. cloth, 30s.

BAXTER'S SAINT'S EVERLASTING REST, and CALL to the UNCONVERTED; Alleine's Alarm; and Fletcher's Address to Penitents. In one vol. 8vo. plates; cloth, 12s.

BAXTER'S DYING THOUGHTS, 18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

BEAUFOY'S GUIDE to TRUE PILGRIMS, and Touchstone for Deceived Souls, 18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

BEAUTY of the BRITISH ALPS, or Love at First Sight, 1 vol. 8vo. cloth, 10s.

BEE, (the) FIRESIDE COMPANION, and EVENING TALES. Edited by the late Samuel Drew, A.M. One vol. 8vo. 12s.

BLAIR'S SERMONS; Family Edition, with a Portrait, and Life of the Author. One vol. 8vo. 12s.

BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, (the) Large Print, NEW VERSION of PSALMS; plates, one handsome volume, neatly bound, embossed cover and gilt edges, price 12s. Morocco, gilt edges, 18s.

BOLTON'S FOUR LAST THINGS; Death, Judgement, Hell, Heaven; also Helps to Humiliation, 18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

BOSTON'S CROOK in the LOT; or the Sovereignty and Wisdom of God in the Afflictions of Men Displayed, 18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

BOOK of GEMS, comprising Select Extracts from the Works of One Hundred British Poets, illustrated by One Hundred British Artists. With Biographical Notices of the Poets, and Fac-Similes of their Autographs. In two 8vo. vols., containing upwards of One Hundred exquisitely-finished Engravings on steel. By S. C. HALL, Esq. Price £2. 2s.

"It is indeed a Book of Gems."—*Times*.

"This book is happily designed, happily executed, and happily named."—*Morning Chronicle*.

"Its contents are not for a year, nor an age, but for all time."—*Examiner*.

"A work which for beauty of illustration and elegance of arrangement, has seldom, if ever, been surpassed."—*John Bull*.

"It is indeed a 'daintie' book."—*Spectator*.

BOGATZKY'S GOLDEN TREASURY for the Children of God, royal 18mo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

BRIDE'S (The) BOOK. A Code of Morals and Conduct; selected from Works of Eminent Writers, for the use of Young Married Women. By Mrs. H. C. CADDICK; 32mo. bound in silk, 2s.

BUCHANAN'S HISTORY of SCOTLAND. A new Illustrated Edition, with Notes, and a continuation to the Marriage of Victoria. By the Rev. G. N. WRIGHT, M.A. Embellished with Views and Portraits, uniform with Goldsmith's illustrated History of England, neatly bound in cloth, 20s.

BUCHAN'S DOMESTIC MEDICINE, greatly improved by an eminent Physician; portrait, 12s.

BUCKINGHAM'S AMERICA, Historical, Statistical, and Descriptive. With a Portrait of the Author, and Seventy Wood Engravings. Three vols. 8vo. cloth, £2. 2s.

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. The Pictorial Edition with Notes by William Mason, and a Life of John Bunyan, by JOSIAH CONDER, Esq. Beautifully illustrated with Twenty-five Engravings, from J. M. W. Turner, H. Melville, and George Baxter; a Portrait by William Derby, from the Original Picture by Holl, and a graphic representation of Vanity Fair by George Cruikshank. The text has been most carefully collated with the authorized edition, containing *the Author's own last Additions and Corrections*. In one handsome 8vo. volume, cloth elegant, 21s.

The same work in morocco elegant, 30s.

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. With Notes by MASON. Plates, cloth, 9s.

BURDER'S (Rev. Geo.) VILLAGE SERMONS. With a Memoir and Portrait of the Author. A new and handsome edition, 8vo. cloth, 10s.

BURKITT on the NEW TESTAMENT; one large quarto volume, a very useful Family Expositor, and Practical Commentary on the New Testament, cloth, 30s.

BURROUGH'S RARE JEWEL of CHRISTIAN CONTENTMENT, 18mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

CAMDEN'S HISTORY of ENGLAND, continued to the Reign of George the Fourth, by J. Watkins, LL.D. Plates; 2 volumes, folio, cloth, 3l. 3s.

CARNE'S LIVES of EMINENT MISSIONARIES, 2 vols. cloth, 12s.

"Mr. Carne has recently published a Life of Eliot, &c., which shows so much of heart and good feeling, as well as of diligent research, that we are sure it will be very popular. We hope he means to give us a complete Missionary Plutarch."—*Quarterly Review*.

CARNE'S LIVES of EMINENT ROMAN CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES. Cloth, 6s.

CECILIA, or the Memoirs of an Heiress. By the Author of Evelina. One volume, 8vo. plates, cloth, 10s.

CHALLONER'S HOLY CATHOLIC BIBLE, (under the patronage and sanction of the late Rev. Dr. Bramston.) One folio volume, in large type for Family reading, with plates, cloth, 3l. 3s., calf, 4l.

CHARLOTTE TEMPLE, a Tale of Truth, by Mrs. Rowson, 12mo. cloth, 4s.

CHILDREN of the ABBEY, one vol. 8vo. plates, cloth, 15s.

CLARKE'S (DR. ADAM) FAMILY BIBLE; a new and very cheap edition, in one large folio volume, very large print, plates, cloth, 60s., calf, 3l. 10s.

The same Work, with Apocrypha, cloth, 68s., calf, 4l.

COLONIAL MAGAZINE, (The) AND COMMERCIAL MARITIME JOURNAL. Edited by ROBERT MONTGOMERY MARTIN, Esq. Author of "The History of the British Colonies," &c. Published monthly, price 2s. 6d. Embellished with Views, Maps, Portraits, &c.

"The Editor is eminently practical in his views and suggestions; and the Colonial Magazine conveys more useful information in one number, than is to be found in volumes of vast pretensions upon our colonial history and policy."—*The Sun*.

The back portion of the work can be had in numbers, at 2s. 6d., or volumes, bound in cloth, 10s. 6d. each.

COTTAGER'S (the) FAMILY BIBLE, with Notes, chiefly selected from Henry, Burkitt, Doddridge, Wesley, &c. by James Wood. One volume, crown folio, with many plates, cloth, 50s., calf, 3l. 3s.

COPLEY'S SCRIPTURE BIOGRAPHY; comprehending all the Names mentioned in the Old and New Testaments. One vol. demy 8vo. containing upwards of 600 pages, cloth, 12s.

COPLEY'S YOUNG WOMAN'S OWN BOOK, and FEMALE INSTRUCTOR. A Compendium of Practical Instruction, designed to form the Character for the various and important duties of Daughter, Sister, Wife, Mother, Friend. With numerous Plates, cloth, 12s.

DEATH of ABEL, 12mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

DIORAMA (The) and FIRESIDE COMPANION, &c. By the late S. DREW, A.M., cloth, 12s.

DODDRIDGE'S RISE and PROGRESS of RELIGION in the SOUL; 18mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

DICTIONARY of the BIBLE, chiefly selected from Calmet and others. By JAMES WOOD. Two vols. 8vo., plates, cloth, 20s.

DREW'S (SAMUEL) ESSAY on the IMMATERIALITY and IMMORTALITY of the HUMAN SOUL. Seventh Edition, carefully revised and enlarged by the Author, a few months prior to his death. In one vol. crown 8vo. with a Portrait, price 6s. cloth.

"His work on the Soul is truly wonderful, and nothing like it was ever published."—*Professor Kidd, in a Letter to Mr. J. H. Drew.*

"His master-piece of metaphysical argument is contained in his Essay on the Soul, from which he has been styled the English Plato."—*Christian Remembrancer.*

DREW'S (SAMUEL, M.A.) REMAINS, Religious and Literary, Sermons, Essays, &c. &c. One vol. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

DREW'S (J. H.) LIFE OF SAMUEL DREW, M.A. Second Edition, with considerable additions and improvements; 8vo., cloth, with a Portrait, 12s.

"Incident, anecdote, or sentiment, is in every page; and the piety, not enthusiasm, but religious philosophy, that runs throughout, gives a charm to the whole."—*Christian Advocate*.

EDWARD the ORPHAN. A Tale founded on facts. One vol. 12mo., plates, cloth, 5s.

ELLIS'S (Rev. W.) POLYNESIAN RESEARCHES, during a Residence of nearly Eight Years in the Society and Sandwich Islands. Forming a complete history of the South Sea Islands. Four vols. cloth, 24s.

"This is the most interesting work in all its parts, we have ever perused."—*Quarterly Review*.

"They are replete with valuable and curious matter, descriptive of the South Sea Islands, and their inhabitants."—*Literary Gazette*.

ELLIS'S (Rev. W.) Improved Edition of STEWART'S VISIT to the SOUTH SEAS; including Notices of Brazil, Peru, Manilla, Cape of Good Hope, and St. Helena. One volume, uniform with "Polynesian Researches," price 6s.

ELLIS'S MEMOIR of the late Mrs. ELLIS. With a Portrait, cloth, 5s.

ELLIS'S (Mrs.) WOMEN of ENGLAND, their Social Duties and Domestic Habits. One neat volume, cloth, 9s., silk, 11s., morocco elegant, 15s.

"We know no volume better calculated to exercise a powerful, lasting, and beneficial influence. If we could have our own way, every family should order a copy of 'The Women of England.' *Husbands, especially young Husbands, should buy it for their Wives; Fathers for their Daughters; Brothers, for their Sisters.*"—*Methodist Mag.*

ELLIS'S (Mrs.) SUMMER and WINTER in the PYRENEES, uniform with the "Women of England." Cloth, 9s.; silk, 11s.; morocco, 15s.

ELLIS'S (Mrs.) FAMILY SECRETS: or, Hints to those who would make Home happy. In monthly numbers. Every Number will be embellished with a highly-finished Engraving on Steel. Price 1s.

"The tendency of this work is one of the best and noblest. The scenes and characters are, it is believed, Portraits."

ELLIS'S (Mrs.) SONS of the SOIL. A Poem in twelve books. Embellished with twelve exquisitely finished Wood Cuts; neatly bound and gilt, 10s. 6d.

EVANS'S BELIEVER'S POCKET COMPANION, with Mason's Devout Sayings. Price 6d.; bound, 1s.

EVIDENCES of CHRISTIANITY; in their External Divisions. By CHARLES P. M'ILVAINE, D.D., Bishop of Ohio. Published under the superintendence of the late OLINTHUS GREGORY, LL.D. Cloth, 6s.

FATHERLESS FANNY, or a Young Lady's first entrance into Life, being the Memoirs of a Little Mendicant and her Benefactors. One vol. 8vo. cloth, 15s.

FISHER'S READY RECKONER, red sheep, 2s.

FIVE ORDERS of ARCHITECTURE ILLUSTRATED; 4to. sewed, 5s.

FLEETWOOD'S LIFE of CHRIST; with the Lives of the Apostles and Evangelists. A Defence of the Christian Religion, by PHILIP DODDRIDGE, D.D. And an exhortation to, and directions for, reading the Holy Scriptures. With Engravings after the Original Paintings, by Carlo Dolci, Carlo Cignani, Claude, L. Caracci, Rembrandt, Leonardo da Vinci, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Benjamin West, &c. In one vol. Quarto, bound in cloth, 18s.; cloth, gilt edges, 20s.

FOX'S CHRISTIAN MARTYROLOGY, including Accounts of the Ten Great Persecutions under the Roman Emperors; and a Minute Narration of the Rise and Progress of the Inquisition. Edited by the late ADAM CLARKE, LL.D., F.S.A. &c. In one 4to. volume, highly embellished; cloth, 21s.; cloth gilt edges, 23s.

GOLDSMITH'S HISTORY of ENGLAND, ILLUSTRATED.

From the Earliest Times to the Death of George the Second, and continued to the Marriage of Queen Victoria, by the Rev. G. N. WRIGHT, M.A. In two handsome volumes, embellished with upwards of Twenty beautifully engraved Plates; cloth, price 21s. The Engravings may be ranked amongst the best specimens of the art; and the originals whence they are derived, are to be found in our great Public Galleries, and in the Private Collections of the Nobility.

GOLDSMITH'S HISTORY of the EARTH and ANIMATED NATURE. Coloured plates, 4 vols. 8vo. cloth, £2. 2s.

GREEN'S BOTANICAL, MEDICAL, and AGRICULTURAL DICTIONARY, and **UNIVERSAL HERBAL**, &c. Coloured plates, 2 vols. 4to. cloth, £7.10s.; plain plates, £3. 10s.

GREGORY'S (DR. OLINTHUS) MEMOIR OF JOHN MASON GOOD, M.D., F.R.S.L., &c. With a Portrait, cloth, price 6s.

HALL'S HELP to ZION'S TRAVELLERS, 18mo. cloth, 2s.

HENRY'S PLEASANTNESS of a RELIGIOUS LIFE, addressed to Young People, 18mo., cloth, 1s. 6d.

HENRY'S (MATTHEW) EXPOSITION of the Old and New Testaments; Genuine and Unabridged Edition, with Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Writings of the Author, by Sir J. BICKERTON WILLIAMS, F.S.A. In three vols. imperial 8vo., bound in cloth, price £3. 3s.

"At the risk of trespassing upon that refinement which, though false, is far from uncommon, I must be allowed to remark, that notwithstanding so many editions of the Commentary have long circulated through the United Kingdom, not to mention one in the Dutch language, which, about the middle of the last century, appeared upon the continent, I am mistaken if any copy among them all, has equalled the present. The convenience of its size; the accuracy of its execution; the moderateness of its price; and the general beauty of its appearance; conspire to invite comparison, and render honest censure impossible."
—J. Bickerton Williams.

HERVEY'S MEDITATIONS and CONTEMPLATIONS.

Plates, one vol. 8vo., cloth, 9s.

HEWLETT'S SCRIPTURE HISTORY for YOUTH, containing upwards of One Hundred and Thirty Engravings on steel. In two vols., half-bound in morocco, gilt edges, price 18s.

"Quite a treasure for any deserving child from six years of age to the time of teens."—*Literary Gazette*.

HEWLETT'S SCRIPTURE NATURAL HISTORY FOR YOUTH. Containing Eighty Engravings on steel. In two vols., half-bound in morocco, gilt edges, price 12s.

"Such a book as this is greatly fitted to endear the Scriptures to the rising generation, and to render the perusal of them at once delightful and profitable."—*Evangelical Magazine*.

HENRY EARL of MORELAND, or the FOOL of QUALITY.

Plates, one vol. 8vo., cloth, 9s.

HOOKE'S ROMAN HISTORY, three vols. 8vo. cloth. Price 15s.

HOWE'S (REV. JOHN) LIVING TEMPLE. Self-dedication, and on Yielding ourselves to God; 18mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

JAMIESON'S MECHANICS for PRACTICAL MEN, with numerous Plates, and upwards of Two Hundred diagrams in wood, cloth, 12s.

JAMIESON'S DICTIONARY of MECHANICAL SCIENCE, ARTS, MANUFACTURES, and MISCELLANEOUS KNOWLEDGE. Illustrated by many hundred Engravings, forming a complete Encyclopædia, in two 4to. vols., cloth, 58s.

JONES'S (W.) MEMOIRS of ROWLAND HILL. One thick 12mo volume, cloth, price 8s.

The Rev. Mr. Sherman, in the preface, says, "This third Memoir, as far as I am capable of judging from fifteen years' acquaintance with the subject, contains a faithful and impartial portrait of his whole character, a description of his real sentiments, and an account of the history, discipline, and institutions of Surrey Chapel, *not to be found in the other Memoirs.*"

"As thousands will feel a strong inclination to obtain a minute acquaintance with the late Rowland Hill, we feel no hesitation in directing their attention to the Memoir by the Author of 'Testamentary Counsels,' in preference to any of its predecessors. *We think no comparison can be instituted between them.*"—*Methodist Magazine.*

JONES on the TRINITY, 18mo., 1s. 6d.

KENNEDY'S VOICE of CONSCIENCE, uniform with "The Women of England." In one vol. post 8vo., cloth, price 7s. 6d.

LANDON'S (L. E. L.) ZENANA and MINOR POEMS, with a Memoir of L. E. L., by EMMA ROBERTS, cloth, 7s.; morocco elegant, 10s. 6d.

LIFE AND SERVICES OF ADMIRAL LORD NELSON, By the Rev. JAMES STANIER CLARK, F.R.S., and JOHN M'ARTHUR, LL.D. Embellished with Forty highly-finished Engravings. Three Vols. cloth, £2. 2s.

"Every Englishman ought to possess this interesting and important biography, forming a complete naval history of the last half-century."

LIFE AND CAMPAIGNS of the DUKE of WELLINGTON, K.G. Embracing his Personal, Political, and Military Memoirs. By the Rev. G. N. WRIGHT, M.A., Author of "The Life and Reign of William IV." Embellished with more than Fifty Engravings, principally highly-finished Portraits of distinguished Generals and Statesmen, His Grace's Companions and Contemporaries. Four Vols. handsomely bound and gilt, price 14s. each volume. Dedicated, by permission, to The Most Noble the Marquess of Anglesey, K.G.

"It is called the 'Illustrated Life,' and bears out that distinction by some very striking Portraits, which possess the merit of being very good likenesses, as well as good engravings. The narrative is clearly written, and crowded with facts that carry internal evidence of the industry bestowed on the undertaking."—*Atlas.*

"In addition to the talents of Mr. Wright, Mr. Fisher is enabled to give illustrations with which *no rival can compete.*"—*John Bull.*

MANGNALL'S HISTORICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS for Young People, Fisher's New Pictorial Edition, corrected and continued to the present time, by the Rev. INGRAM COBBIN, M.A., with numerous wood engravings, neatly bound, in embossed roan, price 4s. 6d.

MASON on SELF KNOWLEDGE, 18mo., cloth, 2s.

MASON'S SELECT REMAINS, 18mo., cloth, 1s. 6d.

M'KERNAN on PRINTING and DYEING SILK. "A most useful work." Plates, cloth, 5s.

MISSIONARY REMAINS; or Sketches of the Lives of Evarts, Cornelius, and Wisner. With an Introduction by S. H. Cox, D.D., and Notes by the Rev. W. Ellis. Cloth, 2s.

MILTON'S PARADISE LOST and REGAINED, and other Poems; 8vo. plates, cloth, 9s.

MEMOIR of HANNAH MORE. Embellished with a Portrait, and a View of her favourite Residence, Barley Wood; 18mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

MORE'S (HANNAH) POPULAR WORKS. With Notes, and a Memoir of the Author. Embellished with a Portrait. A View of Barley Wood, and a highly-finished Vignette Title to each volume. Complete in 8 vols. cloth, gilt, 2*l*.

The same Work, cloth elegant, gilt edges, 2*l*. 8*s*.

Contents of each Volume, which may be had separately ; cloth, 5*s*.

- Vol. 1. Memoirs of the Author ;—Author's Preface to her Works ;—Stories for Persons in the Middle Ranks ;—Tales for the Common People.
- Vol. 2. Tales for the Common People, continued ;—Thoughts on the Importance of the Manners of the Great ;—An Estimate of the Religion of the Fashionable World.
- Vol. 3. Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education.
- Vol. 4. Hints towards forming the Character of a Young Princess.
- Vol. 5. Tragedies and Poems.
- Vol. 6. Poems—Sacred Dramas—Essays, &c.
- Vol. 7. Cœlebs in Search of a Wife.
- Vol. 8. Practical Piety.

MORISON'S (Dr. J.) FAMILY PRAYERS for every Morning and Evening throughout the Year, and additional Prayers for special occasions, &c. ; imperial 8vo. one volume, cloth, gilt edges, 1*l*. 1*s*. ; calf, marbled edges, £1. 6*s* ; morocco elegant, £1. 13*s*.

This work is strongly recommended by the Revs. Henry Blunt, B. Boothroyd, D.D., J. Leitchild James Sherman, Caleb Morris, Thomas Raffles, J. Pye Smith, R. Vaughan, Ralph Wardlaw, D.D., &c.

MORISON'S (Dr. J.) PARENT'S FRIEND. A Manual of Domestic Instruction and Discipline. Cloth, gilt edges, 3*s*. 6*d*.

"A better manual cannot be put into the hands of Christian families."—*Literary Gazette*.

"It appears to us eminently destined to give a fresh and hallowed impulse to domestic instruction and discipline."—*Evangelical Magazine*.

MURRAY'S NEW PRACTICAL COOK and HOUSEKEEPER, or ORACLE of COOKERY, formed for Domestic Economy in Private Families. One vol. 8vo. cloth, 12*s*.

MYERS' NEW and COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM of MODERN GEOGRAPHY ; Mathematical, Physical, Political, and Commercial ; with coloured Maps, forming a complete Atlas ; Views ; and other Engravings. By Thomas Myers, LL.D. 2 vols. 4to. cloth, 5*l*.

NAVAL FLAGS of all NATIONS ; finely coloured. Sewed, stiff cover, 5*s*.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY of ILLUSTRIOUS and EMINENT PERSONAGES of the Nineteenth Century, with Memoirs. Five vols. containing upwards of 180 Portraits and Memoirs. Per vol., in cloth, gilt edges, 1*l*. 12*s*.

NELSON'S (JOHN) JOURNAL from his Youth to the 42nd Year of his Age. With a Memoir ; 12mo. cloth, 2*s*.

NICHOLSON'S (PETER) CABINET MAKER, UPHOLSTERER, and DECORATOR. 104 plates, plain and coloured ; one vol. 4to., cloth, 2*l*. 2*s*.

NICHOLSON'S (PETER) CARPENTER, JOINER, and BUILDER'S COMPANION, and Book of Lines. 128 plates ; one vol. 8vo., cloth, 1*l*. 3*s*.

OLD ARM CHAIR, (The) or Recollections of a Bachelor, 1 vol. 12mo. cloth, 4*s*.

ORTON (JOB) on ETERNITY, price 6*d*. ; bound, 1*s*.

PETTIGREW'S MEDICAL PORTRAIT GALLERY, containing 36 Portraits, and Biographical Memoirs of the most celebrated Physicians, Surgeons, &c. who have contributed to the advancement of Medical Science. In two volumes, imperial 8vo., half morocco, price 2*l.* 2*s.*

PALEY'S WORKS. Complete in two very neat volumes, 8vo. With Portrait and Life, cloth, 20*s.*

PAMELA, or VIRTUE REWARDED; in one volume, 8vo. plates, 12*s.*

PARENTAL PRESENT of PRETTY STORIES; or Evening Amusement for Good Children. By Miss Hitchon. With a plate, neatly bound, cloth, 2*s.*

PLATT'S MANNERS and CUSTOMS of ALL NATIONS. 13 Plates, one vol. 8vo. 15*s.*

PLATT'S BOOK of CURIOSITIES, or Wonders of the Great World. Plates, 8vo. 15*s.*

PLATT'S PLEASURES of HUMAN LIFE. Plates, 8vo. 15*s.*

PRICE'S (Rev. Dr.) MEMOIR OF W. WILBERFORCE, Esq. Cloth, 2*s.*

RECTOR OF OVERTON. 3 vols. 12mo. 15*s.*

ROBINSON'S SCRIPTURE CHARACTERS. Portrait and Life of the Author. One vol. 8vo. 12*s.*

ROCKAVON, a Tale of the 15th Century, 3 vols. bds. 15*s.*

RUSSELL'S COMPLETE ATLAS of the WORLD, containing 34 Maps, coloured, cloth, 12*s.*

RUSSELL'S SEVEN SERMONS on the UNPARDONABLE SIN, cloth, 2*s.*

RUSSELL'S CALCULATOR of WAGES, sewed, 1*s.*

SCOTT'S (Rev. Thomas) FAMILY BIBLE. FISHER'S ILLUSTRATED EDITION, to be completed in about 40 Monthly Parts, at 2*s.*, EVERY PART embellished with a highly-finished Engraving on Steel, forming a series of views of the principal places mentioned in Scripture, from Drawings on the spot.

Fisher's edition of this invaluable Commentary is reprinted from the last which the author published in the vigour of life;—a genuine and authentic work, consisting wholly and entirely of the labours of the Rev. Thomas Scott ALONE.

SCOTT'S FORCE of TRUTH, cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.*

SCURRY'S (JAMES) CAPTIVITY and SUFFERINGS during Ten Years in India, cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

SELECT NOVELS, viz. Old English Baron, Rasselas, and Vicar of Wakefield. In one vol. 8vo. cloth, 12*s.*

SERLE'S CHRISTIAN PARENT. Cloth. 1*s.* 6*d.*

SERLE'S CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER. Cloth. 2*s.*

SELECT LIBRARY; uniformly printed and bound in cloth, 6s.
each volume, fcap. 8vo.

ELLIS'S POLYNESIAN RESEARCHES, 4 vols. 24s.

STEWART'S VISIT TO THE SOUTH SEAS, 6s.

CARNE'S LIVES OF EMINENT MISSIONARIES, 2 vols. 12s.

CARNE'S LIVES OF EMINENT ROMAN CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES, 6s.

GREGORY'S (DR. OLINTHUS) LIFE OF DR. MASON GOOD, 6s.

M'ILVAINE'S (BISHOP OF OHIO) EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, 6s.

SHAKSPEARE'S DRAMATIC WORKS, with Notes. Portrait,
and 230 Engravings, 8vo. cloth, 16s. Very elegantly bound in cloth, gilt edges, 18s.

SHERMAN'S GUIDE to ACQUAINTANCE with GOD, 18mo.
cloth, 2s.

SHERMAN'S PLEA for the SABBATH. Cloth, 32mo. 1s.

SHERMAN'S CHRISTIAN'S DEATH and HEAVEN. Cloth,
32mo. 1s.

SHERMAN'S MEMOIR of MARTHA NUTT. Sewed, 6d.

SIBBES'S BRUISED REED and SMOKING FLAX. Cloth. 1s.

SMITH'S PANORAMA of SCIENCE and ART, 49 Plates.
Cloth. 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 15s.

**SPRING'S (Dr. Gardiner) HINTS to PARENTS on the RELI-
GIOUS EDUCATION of CHILDREN.** Cloth, 2s.

TELL-TALE and FIRESIDE COMPANION, &c. Edited by
the late S. DREW, M.A. 1 vol. 8vo. with 48 Engravings on Wood. Cloth, 12s.

**TOWNE'S COMPLETE FARMER, GRAZIER, PLANTER,
FARRIER, and AGRICULTURIST'S DOMESTIC GUIDE.** 21 Plates. 1 vol. 4to.
cloth. A good practical Work. £1. 1s.

WALKER'S PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY, with Portrait.
Considerably enlarged and improved. Cloth, gilt label. 9s.

**WALKER'S KEY to the Classical Pronunciation of Greek, Latin,
and Scripture Proper Names.** Greatly improved by Rev. W. TROLLOPE, A.M. 8vo.
price 4s., uniform with Fisher's Improved Edition of WALKER'S PRONOUNCING
DICTIONARY. Cloth. 4s.

The Dictionary and Key bound together, in Cloth, with gilt label, 12s.

WATTS'S PSALMS and HYMNS, Pulpit and Family Edition.
Very large Print. One vol. 8vo. bound in sheep, 9s.; calf, gilt edges, 12s.

WATTS'S DISCOURSES on the WORLD to COME. Plates.
One vol. cloth, 9s.

WESLEY'S (Rev. JOHN) SERMONS. Portrait, and Life of the
Author by S. DREW, M.A. Two vols. 8vo. cloth, £1.

WHITEFIELD'S SERMONS. Portrait, and Life of the Author
by S. DREW, M.A. 8vo. cloth, 12s.

WHISTON'S JOSEPHUS. Complete in one vol. with Maps and
Plates. 8vo. cloth, 15s.

WILBERFORCE'S PRACTICAL VIEW of CHRISTIANITY,
with a Memoir by the Rev. T. Price. 18mo. cloth, 3s.

WRIGHT'S (Rev. G. N.) LIFE and REIGN of WILLIAM IV.
Embellished with 16 highly finished plates, principally Portraits of celebrated Naval
Commanders, from the Original Paintings in the Naval Gallery of Greenwich Hospital.
The ninth thousand; 2 volumes, cloth, 18s.

"A very opportune and useful performance, collecting all the important events of the late reign, and
enlivening them with a great collection of anecdote. The work is elegantly got up, and does credit to the
taste and activity of its publishers."—*Literary Gazette*.

YOUNG'S NIGHT THOUGHTS, BLAIR'S GRAVE, and
other Poems. One vol. 8vo., plates, cloth, 9s.

YOUNG MAN'S COMPANION and Self-Instructor, 8vo. Plates,
cloth, 12s.

YOUNG WOMAN'S COMPANION and Female Instructor, 8vo.
Plates, cloth, 12s.

YOUNG CHRISTIAN'S POCKET LIBRARY of RELIGIOUS
KNOWLEDGE; consisting of Serle's Christian Remembrancer, Serle's Christian Parents,
Bogatzky's Golden Treasury, Scott's Force of Truth, Henry's Pleasantness of Religion,
Hall's Help to Zion's Travellers, Doddridge's Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul,
Jones on the Doctrine of a Trinity, Baxter's Dying Thoughts, Mason on Self-Knowledge,
&c. &c., making six handsome volumes, 4s. per vol. in cloth, 17. 4s.

PORTRAITS RECENTLY PUBLISHED,

Royal Quarto, India Proofs, 2s. each; Plain Proofs, 1s.

African Witnesses: contain-
ing Portraits of Dr. Philip,
A. Stoffles, Tzatzoe, Rev.
J. Read, sen. and jun.
Bradford, John, Martyr.
Bunyan, John.
Buxton, T. F. Esq.
Carey, Dr. W. & his Pundit.
Clarkson, Thomas, Esq.

Clarke, Dr. A. and the two
Budhu Priests.
Fletcher, Mrs. (late Miss J.
Jewsbury.)
Fry, Mrs. Elizabeth.
Harris, Rev. J. Author of
"Mammon," &c.
Hemans, Felicia.
Jan Tzatzoe, Caffre Chief.

Jay, Rev. William, Bath.
Leang Afa, the Chinese
Evangelist.
Morrison, Dr. and his Chi-
nese Assistants.
Ryder, Dr. late Bishop of
Lichfield and Coventry.
Stallybrass, Mrs (the late)
Wilberforce, (late) W. Esq.

MEDICAL PORTRAITS.

Abernethy, John, F.R.S.
Æsculapius and Telesphorus.
Akenside, M., M.D., F.R.S.
Albinus, B. Siegfried, M.D.
Baillie, Matt., M.D., F.R.S.
Baron, John, M.D., F.R.S.
Bichât, M. F. Xavier, M.D.
Blundell, James, M.D.
Bright, R., M.D., F.R.S.
Brodie, Sir B. C., Bt., F.R.S.
Caius, John, M.D.
Carlisle, Sir Anthony, F.R.S.
Cooke, John, M.D., F.R.S.

Clarke, Sir C., Bart, M.D.
F.R.S.
Cooper, Sir A. P., Bt., F.R.S.
Copland, J. M.D., F.R.S.
Clutterbuck, Henry, M.D.
Halford, Sir H., Bt., F.R.S.
Haller, Albert de, M.D.,
F.R.S.
Hunter, J., F.R.S. (2 Por-
traits).
Hunter, W., M.D., F.R.S.
Huxham, J., M.D., F.R.S.
Jenner, E., M.D., F.R.S.

Johnson, James, M.D.
Lawrence, William, F.R.S.
Linacre, Thomas, M.D.
Malthus, Marc, M.D., F.R.S.
Mead, Richard, M.D., F.R.S.
Morgagni, J. B., M.D., F.R.S.
Pringle, Sir J., Bart., M.P.,
F.R.S.
Radcliffe, John, M.D.
Ruysch, F., M.D., F.R.S.
Vesalius, Andreas.
Wardrop, James, M.D.
Wilson, James, F.R.S.

PORTRAITS,

Engraved by the first-rate Artists, from Paintings by Lawrence, Reynolds, West, Shee, Hoppner, Beechey, Phillips, &c. &c. &c.

PROOFS ON INDIA PAPER, TWO SHILLINGS EACH.

Her Majesty QUEEN VICTORIA.
 His Majesty George the Third.
 His Majesty William the Fourth
 Her Majesty Queen Adelaide
 H. R. H. Frederick, Duke of York
 Edward, Duke of Kent and Strathern

H. R. H. the Duchess of Kent
 Prince Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland—King of Hanover
 H. R. H. the Duke of Sussex
 H. R. H. the Princess Charlotte
 H. R. H. Prince George of Cumberland

Abercromby, Sir Ralph
 Aberdeen, Earl of
 Abernethy, John
 Albemarle, Earl of
 Amherst, Earl
 Angerstein, John Julius
 Anglesey, Marquess of
 Arkwright, Sir Richard
 Baines, Edward, M.P.
 Baird, Sir David
 Banks, Sir Joseph
 Beaufort, Duke of
 Bentham, Jeremy
 Beresford, Viscount
 Bexley, Baron
 Breton, Le, Sir Thomas
 Brewster, Sir David
 Bridgewater, Duke of
 Bridport, Viscount
 Brindley, James
 Bristol, Bishop of, (Gray)
 Brooks, Joshua
 Brougham and Vaux, Baron
 Burdett, Sir Francis
 Burke, Edmund
 Byron, Lord George
 Calcutta, Bp. of, (Wilson)
 Camden, Marquis
 Campbell, Sir Archibald
 Campbell, Thomas
 Canning, George
 Canterbury, Abp. (Howley)
 Carlisle, Earl of
 Chichester, Bishop of, (Carr)
 Clarke, Rev. Adam
 Clementi, Muzio
 Clifden, Viscount
 Codrington, Sir Edward
 Collingwood, Baron
 Combermere, Viscount
 Cooper, Sir Astley Paston
 Cornwallis, Marquis
 Croker, John Wilson
 Crompton, Samuel
 Cunningham, Allan
 Curran, John Philpot
 Davy, Sir Humphry
 Donkin, Sir Rufane
 Dover, Baron (Agar Ellis)
 Dover, Baroness
 Doyle, Sir Charles William
 Duncan, Lord
 Dundas, Robert
 Durham, Baron
 Durham, Bp. of, (Barrington)
 Egremont, Earl of
 Eldon, Earl of
 Ellenborough, Lord

Exeter, Bishop of, (Carey)
 Exmouth, Viscount
 Faraday, Michael
 Fife, Earl of
 Fitzwilliam, Earl
 Fox, Charles James
 Franklin, Sir John
 Fuseli, Henry
 Gambier, Lord
 Gardner, Baron, (Alan Hyde)
 Gardner, Baron, (Adm. Alan)
 Gifford, William
 Gilbert, Davies
 Goderich, Viscount
 Grant, Sir William
 Grantham, Lord
 Gregory, Olinthus
 Grenville, Thomas
 Grenville, Lord
 Gloucester, Bp. of, (Monk)
 Hall, Rev. R.
 Hardy, Sir T.
 Harewood, Earl of
 Harrowby, Earl of
 Hastings, Marquis of
 Hastings, Warren
 Heathfield, Lord, (Elliot)
 Heaviside, John
 Heber, Reginald, D.D.
 Hertford, Marquis of
 Hobhouse, Sir Benjamin
 Hooker, Professor
 Holland, Baron
 Howe, Admiral
 Hume, Abraham, Bart.
 Hunter, John
 Huskisson, William
 Jameson, Robert
 Jeffrey, Francis
 Jerdan, William
 Johnston, Sir Alexander
 Jones, Sir W.
 Keith, Admiral Lord
 Kemble, John Philip
 Kenyon, Lord, (Baron Gre-
 dington)
 Lansdowne, Marquis of
 Lawrence, Sir Thomas
 Lee, Professor
 Leopold, Prince, (King of
 the Belgians)
 Leslie, Sir John
 Liverpool, Earl of
 Londonderry, Marquis of
 Lyndhurst, Baron
 Lynedoch, Baron
 Lysons, Samuel
 Mackintosh, Sir James

Melbourne, Viscount
 Melville, Viscount, (late)
 Melville, Viscount
 Moore, Thomas
 More, Hannah
 Mulgrave, Earl of
 Munro, Sir Thomas
 Munster, Earl of
 Murray, Sir George
 Nares, Archdeacon
 Nelson, Viscount
 Northesk, Earl of
 Norwich, Bishop of
 Ormonde, Marquis of
 Ouseley, Sir Gore
 Palmerston, Viscount
 Parr, Samuel
 Peel, Sir Robert, Bart.
 Peel, Sir Robert, (late Bart.)
 Perceval, Spencer
 Peterborough, Bp. of (Marsh)
 Picton, Sir Thomas
 Pitt, William
 Plumer, Sir Thomas
 Porson, Richard
 Porter, Anna Maria
 Porter, Jane
 Porteus, Beilby, Bp. of Lond.
 Reynolds, Sir Joshua
 Richmond, Duke of
 Rodney, Admiral Lord
 Roscoe, William
 Roxburghe, Duke of
 Scott, Sir Walter
 Shaftesbury, Earl of
 Sheridan, Richard Brinsley
 Shipley, Sir Charles
 Shrewsbury, Earl of
 Soane, Sir John
 Spencer, Earl
 Stafford, Marchioness of
 Stanley, E. G.
 Stuart, Dugald
 Tenterden, Baron
 Torrens, Sir Henry
 Troubridge, Sir Thomas
 Verulam, Earl of
 Vincent, Earl St.
 Wellesley, Marquis
 Wellington, Duke of
 West, Benjamin
 Whitworth, Viscount
 Wilkie, David
 Woollaston, William Hyde
 Wordsworth, William
 Wrangham, Archdeacon
 Wyattville, Sir Jeffrey
 Young, Thomas

THE COLONIAL MAGAZINE

AND

COMMERCIAL-MARITIME JOURNAL.

EDITED BY ROBERT MONTGOMERY MARTIN, Esq.

Author of "The History of the British Colonies," &c.

Published Monthly. Price 2s. 6d. Embellished with Views, Maps, Portraits, &c.

Vols. I. to IV. in cloth, 10s. 6d. each, are ready.

Blackwood's Magazine.—"The Colonial Magazine, a newly-established miscellany, full of valuable information, and which will prove of the very highest importance."

Literary Gazette.—"The Colonial Magazine is a solid and able publication, which will be of infinite value both to the mother-country and to those wonderfully extensive colonies which are changing the face of the habitable globe, and carrying the English language from pole to pole."

London Journal of Commerce.—"At this particular moment, every subject connected with our colonies is of vital interest. It is highly gratifying, therefore, to find an individual of such high reputation becoming the Editor of the work. A 'Commercial Maritime Journal,' conducted with good sense, and furnishing the public with accurate information, must be received with enthusiastic welcome."

Liverpool Albion.—"If the Editor of The Colonial Magazine were unknown, and his abilities were to be tested by the first specimen of this new periodical, we should have no hesitation in pronouncing a highly favourable opinion."

Dublin Monitor.—"It is interspersed with important and valuable statistical tables; indeed, we never saw such an aggregate of essential facts—the pith of an hundred parliamentary folios is compressed into this valuable publication, which should be in the hands of every man interested in the 'ships, colonies, and commerce' of England."

Leicester Chronicle.—"While the periodical literature of the country is devoted almost wholly to subjects of *ephemeral* interest, is it not a matter of surprise, that, with the exception of the work before us, not one has hitherto been dedicated exclusively to the interesting subject of *Colonial Government*?"

Bath Journal.—"The Editor of The Colonial Magazine has devoted a third portion of his life in endeavouring to make the incalculable advantages of our Colonies better understood; and in proportion as they are so, will they be appreciated."

Edinburgh Caledonian Mercury.—"The Magazine now before us, besides a mass of colonial intelligence, contains a number of original articles of great merit, embodying much statistical and other information, which could not be obtained elsewhere. All who feel an interest in the prosperity of our colonial possessions—and that includes almost every man, woman, and child in the country—will in this new Magazine be gratified and instructed with the mass of information brought under their consideration."

Bath Post.—"Few works are of less ephemeral character than this Monthly Magazine. Bound up, it will afford a valuable and safe fund for future reference on all subjects connected with our Colonies."

Felix Farley's Bristol Journal.—"The numbers before us display in every article a most extensive knowledge of the subjects treated on, together with an exemption from party feeling and prejudices rarely to be met with in these days."

Bristol Mercury.—"This Magazine is well got up in its several departments, and must be of immense importance to those concerned with, or at all interested in foreign matters."

Glasgow Courier.—"We have no hesitation in recommending the 'Colonial Magazine' to general acceptance, as one calculated by fair and judicious discussion, to bring prominently before the public great and important interests, which have hitherto been contemned, or altogether overlooked."

Cambridge Advertiser.—"No one can go through the pages of this Magazine without deriving both pleasure and profit from the novel and striking truths which are brought under his notice."

Somersetshire Constitutional.—"This work cannot fail to be attractive to the merchant, manufacturer, and ship-owner, and will excite an interest in all those who have connections in our old or new colonies."

LONDON: FISHER, SON, AND CO., PRINTERS.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

Hanbury, Benjamin

Historical Memorials relating to the Independents or Congregations lists
from their Rise to the Restoration of the Monarchy A.D. MDCL

Bd.: 2

London (1841)

H.ref. 174 t-2

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10449295-1